

against any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1398. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of numerous citizens of Bend, Oreg., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the Lankford bill, or any similar compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1399. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Kittanning, Pa., in favor of legislation to provide an increase of pension for Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1400. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of San Diego, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1401. Also, petition of citizens of La Mesa, Calif., and other communities, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1402. Also, petition of citizens of Palo Verde Valley, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1403. Also, petition of citizens of Banning, Calif., and other communities, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1404. Also, petition of citizens of Riverside, Calif., and other communities, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1405. Also, petition of citizens of Escondido, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1406. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of Mr. F. L. Williams and 16 other citizens of the seventh district of Georgia, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1407. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition of numerous residents of Louisville, Ky., protesting against compulsory observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1408. Also, petition of numerous residents of Louisville, Ky., protesting against compulsory observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1409. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of 70 citizens of Van Wert, Ohio, praying for early passage of a bill granting more liberal pensions to Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1410. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of 17 citizens of Lamoni, Decatur County, Iowa, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to increase pensions now allowed to veterans of the Civil War and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1411. Also, petition of 66 citizens of Osceola, Clarke County, Iowa, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to increase pensions now allowed to veterans of the Civil War and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1412. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of 81 residents of St. Louis, Mich., protesting against House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1413. By Mr. WASON: Petition of residents of Keene, N. H., protesting against the enactment into a law of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1414. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of citizens of Rutherford County, N. C., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1415. By Mr. WELLER: Petition of citizens from the State of New York, protesting against the enactment of the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1416. By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Petition of a number of citizens of Burke, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1417. By Mr. WINTER: Resolutions of Greybull Lions Club, Greybull, Wyo.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1418. Also, petition by residents of Goshen County, Wyo., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1419. By Mr. WURZBACH: Petition of Mrs. G. M. Jorgenson, Mary Kelly, G. M. Jorgenson, Robert Henry, and other citizens of San Antonio, Bexar County, Tex., protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1420. Also, petition of A. J. Day, R. N. O'Neal, J. O. Hichek, Thos. G. Morgan, A. E. Mahan, W. F. Redding, and other citizens of Corpus Christi, Nueces County, Tex., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, January 12, 1928

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 11, 1928)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Edwards	McKellar	Shipstead
Barkley	Fess	McLean	Shortridge
Bayard	Fletcher	McMaster	Smoot
Bingham	Frazier	McNary	Steck
Black	George	Mayfield	Steiner
Blaine	Gerry	Metcalf	Stephens
Blease	Gillett	Neely	Swanson
Borah	Gould	Norbeck	Thomas
Brookhart	Greene	Norris	Trammell
Broussard	Hale	Nye	Tydings
Bruce	Harris	Oddie	Tyson
Capper	Harrison	Overman	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Hefflin	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Howell	Ransdell	Warren
Curtis	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Waterman
Cutting	Jones	Reed, Pa.	Wheeler
Dale	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Deneen	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	
Dill	Kling	Sackett	
Edge	La Follette	Sheppard	

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. My colleague the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is necessarily absent. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

## PETITION—ROAD FROM NIAGARA FALLS TO WASHINGTON

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Niagara County (N. Y.) Board of Supervisors, in the nature of a petition, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Supervisor Canavan offered the following preamble and resolution and moved the adoption of the resolution:

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a bill introduced by Representative WILLIAM P. HOLADAY, of Illinois, which provides for the construction of several hard-surfaced Federal post roads, including route No. 64, extending from Niagara Falls, N. Y., to Washington, D. C.; and

"Whereas the eventual construction of the proposed Route No. 64 would afford needed relief for traffic congestion between the cities of Niagara Falls and Buffalo and would be of great commercial value to the communities affected: Now therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Niagara County Board of Supervisors does hereby favor the enactment into law of the aforesaid Holaday bill; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of this board be, and he is hereby, directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Hons. ROYAL S. COPELAND and ROBERT F. WAGNER, United States Senators, and to Congressman S. WALLACE DEMPSEY, Washington, D. C."

The resolution was adopted.

## STATE OF NEW YORK,

## County of Niagara, ss:

This is to certify that I, the undersigned, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Niagara, have compared the foregoing copy of resolution with the original resolution now on file in the office, and which was passed by the board of supervisors of said county on the 30th day of December, 1927, and that the same is a correct and true transcript of such original resolution and of the whole thereof.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the board of supervisors this 5th day of January, 1928.

[SEAL.]

FRED H. KRULL,  
Clerk, Board of Supervisors.

## MINING EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Mr. ODDIE, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (S. 2079) authorizing an appropriation for mining experiment stations of the United States Bureau of Mines, reported it without amendment and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which was agreed to.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 2496) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River on the Dover-Clarksville road in Stewart County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 2497) to amend section 543 of title 28 of the United States Code; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 2498) to amend section 18 of the Judicial Code (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 1, sec. 22); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 2499) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Samuel Woodfill to the position and rank of captain in the Army of the United States and immediately retire him with the rank and pay of a captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2500) for the relief of Timothy C. Harrington; and

A bill (S. 2501) for the relief of Wellington Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2502) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Taylor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2503) granting a pension to George Kinley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2504) granting a pension to James W. Shaw; and

A bill (S. 2505) granting increase of pensions under the general law to soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and their dependents, for disability incurred in service in line of duty, and authorizing that the records of the War and Navy Departments be accepted as to incurrence of a disability in service in line of duty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2506) to amend the packers and stockyards act, 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 2507) to amend paragraphs 743, 746, 757, 763, and 770 of schedule 7 of the tariff act of 1922, relative to agricultural products; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2508) providing that freight, express, and passenger rates shall not be increased without authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission and providing that shippers shall be given at least 60 days' notice of hearings on application for increase of rates; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 2509) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide H. Hadley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of Pennsylvania:

A bill (S. 2510) amending section 1 of the act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. L. 751), providing for the method of selling real estate under an order or decree of any United States court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDELL:

A bill (S. 2511) to change the name of St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum, and amend the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to incorporate St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum, in the District of Columbia,' approved February 25, 1831"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 2512) for the relief of Madie Byrd Tootle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2513) for the relief of John H. Morse; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 2514) for the relief of Mrs. Richard Bell Buchanan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2515) for the relief of the owners of the steam tug *Joshua Lovett*;

A bill (S. 2516) for the relief of the owners and/or receiver of the American steam tug *W. S. Holbrook*; and

A bill (S. 2517) for the relief of the owner of barge *Consolidation Coastwise No. 10*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

A bill (S. 2518) granting an increase of pension to James McDermott (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 2519) for the relief of Robert W. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 2520) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Corson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 2521) to reduce night work in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 2522) granting an increase of pension to Mary Willoughby Osterhaus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 2523) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof; to the Committee on Civil Service.

INVESTIGATION RELATIVE TO SINKING OF THE SUBMARINE "S-4"

Mr. TRAMMELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 109), which, on his request, was ordered to lie over under the rule:

*Resolved*, That a committee composed of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is hereby authorized and created.

*Resolved further*, That it shall be the duty of the said committee to investigate the full facts of the sinking of the submarine S-4 in collision on December 17, 1927, with the United States Coast Guard destroyer *Paulding* off the Massachusetts coast, and the rescue and salvage operations carried on by the United States Navy subsequent thereto. All hearings before the committee shall be open to the public.

*Resolved further*, That to carry out and give effect to the provisions of this resolution the committee hereby created shall have power to issue subpoenas, administer oaths, summon witnesses, require the production of books and papers, and receive testimony taken before any proper officer in any State or Territory of the United States.

*Resolved further*, That the said committee shall immediately proceed with the said investigation and not later than March 15, 1928, make its report to the Senate.

## POWER OR RESERVOIR SITES

On motion of Mr. SMOOT, the bill (S. 1313) to amend section 13, chapter 431, of an act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L. 855), so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue trust and final patents on lands withdrawn or classified as power or reservoir sites, with a reservation of the right of the United States or its permittees to enter upon and use any part of such land for reservoir or power-site purposes, was recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. NYE subsequently reported the foregoing bill from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, which was agreed to.

## CHANGES OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. WARREN, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1922) making an appropriation to pay the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred and paid, at the request of the President, in protecting the harbors and fortifying the coast during the Civil War, in accordance with the findings of the Court of Claims and Senate Report No. 764, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, and it was referred to the Committee on Claims.

On motion of Mr. SHORTHIDGE, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1268) to further amend section 4756 of the Revised Statutes, and it was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

On motion of Mr. REED of Pennsylvania, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2407) to authorize the admission of equipment or material free of duty, and it was referred to the Committee on Finance.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 519. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Ritcherdsen;

H. R. 802. An act to correct the military record of Curtis P. Wise;

H. R. 871. An act for the relief of William Earhart;

H. R. 971. An act for the relief of James K. P. Welch;

H. R. 972. An act for the relief of James C. Simmons, alias James C. Whitlock;

H. R. 1072. An act for the relief of George Adams;

H. R. 1073. An act for the relief of Richard Brannan;

H. R. 1530. An act to amend the military record of William F. Wheeler;



- H. R. 1533. An act for the relief of Theodore Herbert;  
H. R. 1534. An act to correct the military record of John Dewitt Marvin;  
H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of William R. Connolly;  
H. R. 1589. An act for the relief of John J. Waters;  
H. R. 1590. An act to correct the records of the War Department to show that Guy Carlton Baker and Calton C. Baker or Carlton C. Baker is one and the same person;  
H. R. 1931. An act for the relief of Daniel Mangan;  
H. R. 1970. An act for the relief of Dennis W. Scott;  
H. R. 2272. An act for the relief of William Morin;  
H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Lucius Bell;  
H. R. 2294. An act for the relief of George H. Gilbert;  
H. R. 2296. An act to amend the military record of Robert Zink;  
H. R. 2422. An act to correct the military record of Jordan Kidwell;  
H. R. 2472. An act for the relief of Emile Genireux;  
H. R. 2482. An act for the relief of John Jakes;  
H. R. 2523. An act for the relief of Harvey Dunkin;  
H. R. 2524. An act for the relief of Mary M. Jones;  
H. R. 2526. An act for the relief of William Perkins;  
H. R. 2528. An act for the relief of J. W. La Bare;  
H. R. 2649. An act authorizing the President to reappoint John P. Pence, formerly an officer in the Signal Corps, United States Army, an officer in the Signal Corps, United States Army;  
H. R. 2808. An act for the relief of Ella G. Richter, daughter of Henry W. Richter;  
H. R. 2809. An act for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Thomas;  
H. R. 3041. An act for the relief of Alfred St. Dennis;  
H. R. 3049. An act for the relief of Alexander Ashbaugh;  
H. R. 3145. An act for the relief of Willis B. Cross;  
H. R. 3166. An act for the relief of Bert H. Libbey, alias Burt H. Libbey;  
H. R. 3192. An act for the relief of John Costigan;  
H. R. 3216. An act for the relief of Margaret T. Head, administratrix;  
H. R. 3241. An act for the relief of Seymour Buckley;  
H. R. 3315. An act for the relief of Charles A. Black, alias Angus Black;  
H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Estle David;  
H. R. 3394. An act for the relief of W. P. Thompson;  
H. R. 3400. An act to correct the military record of Andrew B. Ritter;  
H. R. 3440. An act for the relief of Alvin H. Tinker;  
H. R. 3458. An act for the relief of Charles Beretta, Isidore J. Proulx, and John J. West;  
H. R. 3466. An act for the relief of George A. Winslow;  
H. R. 3467. An act for the relief of Giles Gordon;  
H. R. 3510. An act to authorize the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Capt. George E. Kraul a captain of Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920;  
H. R. 3673. An act for the relief of Maj. F. Ellis Reed;  
H. R. 3723. An act for the relief of John M. Andrews;  
H. R. 3737. An act for the relief of John T. O'Neill;  
H. R. 3926. An act for the relief of Joseph Jameson;  
H. R. 3969. An act for the relief of James E. Westcott;  
H. R. 3993. An act for the relief of Adam B. Ackerman, alias Adam B. Aunkerman;  
H. R. 4013. An act for the relief of Charles R. Stevens;  
H. R. 4027. An act for the relief of the widow of Warren V. Howard;  
H. R. 4079. An act for the relief of William A. Hynes;  
H. R. 4080. An act for the relief of William Smith;  
H. R. 4104. An act to correct the military record of James William Cole;  
H. R. 4168. An act for the relief of John Strevy, deceased;  
H. R. 4203. An act for the relief of A. S. Guffey;  
H. R. 4280. An act to correct the military record of John W. Cleavenger, deceased;  
H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of Fred R. Nugent;  
H. R. 4652. An act for the relief of Charlie R. Pate;  
H. R. 4654. An act for the relief of Kennedy F. Foster;  
H. R. 4655. An act for the relief of David E. Goodwin;  
H. R. 4660. An act to correct the military record of Charles E. Lowe;  
H. R. 4661. An act to correct the military record of William Mullins;  
H. R. 4702. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Benjamin S. McHenry;  
H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Calvin H. Burkhead;  
H. R. 4777. An act to compensate Robert F. Yeaman for the loss of certain carpenter tools which was incurred by reason of a fire in the Government area at Old Hickory Ordnance Depot;  
H. R. 4902. An act to correct the military record of Charles Robertson;  
H. R. 4926. An act for the relief of the Pocahontas Fuel Co. (Inc.);  
H. R. 4927. An act for the relief of Francis Sweeney;  
H. R. 5065. An act for the relief of James M. Winston;  
H. R. 5224. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Gardner;  
H. R. 5228. An act for the relief of Finas M. Williams;  
H. R. 5230. An act to correct the military record of Pleasant R. W. Harris;  
H. R. 5231. An act to correct the military record of James Shook;  
H. R. 5232. An act to correct the military record of Owen J. Owen;  
H. R. 5255. An act for the relief of Jacob F. Webb;  
H. R. 5297. An act for the relief of Christine Brenzinger;  
H. R. 5300. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Francke and Blanche F. Shelley, sole legal heirs of Ralph K. Warrington;  
H. R. 5336. An act for the relief of John J. Corcoran;  
H. R. 5338. An act for the relief of Roland M. Baker;  
H. R. 5380. An act to correct the military record of G. W. Gilkison;  
H. R. 5381. An act to correct the military record of Thomas Spurrier;  
H. R. 5383. An act to correct the military record of John W. Siple;  
H. R. 5424. An act for the relief of Anthony Schwartzberger;  
H. R. 5894. An act for the relief of the State Bank & Trust Co., of Fayetteville, Tenn.;  
H. R. 5923. An act for the relief of the Sanitarium Co., of Portland, Oreg.;  
H. R. 5994. An act for the relief of George C. Hussey;  
H. R. 6005. An act for the relief of Edward J. Boyle;  
H. R. 6006. An act for the relief of Patrick J. Langan;  
H. R. 6007. An act for the relief of John Magill;  
H. R. 6116. An act for the relief of R. P. Biddle;  
H. R. 6162. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Ross;  
H. R. 6180. An act for the relief of William H. Armstrong;  
H. R. 6185. An act for the relief of Thomas Jefferson Shropshire;  
H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of Henry Shull;  
H. R. 6364. An act for the relief of Edward Tigh;  
H. R. 6389. An act for the relief of Samuel Pelfrey;  
H. R. 6431. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Easterly;  
H. R. 6432. An act for the relief of James E. Moyer;  
H. R. 6438. An act for the relief of David Parrett;  
H. R. 6442. An act for the relief of Ralph H. Lasher, whose name appears in the Army records as Ralph C. Lasher;  
H. R. 6579. An act for the relief of James W. Kingon;  
H. R. 6619. An act for the relief of the estate of William Bardel;  
H. R. 6839. An act to remove the charge of desertion against Israel Brown and to grant him an honorable discharge;  
H. R. 6917. An act to correct the military record of Sylvester De Forest;  
H. R. 7110. An act for the relief of Frances L. Dickinson;  
H. R. 7227. An act for the relief of William H. Dotson;  
H. R. 7228. An act for the relief of Frederick Leininger;  
H. R. 7229. An act for the relief of Henry Simmons;  
H. R. 7553. An act for the relief of James Neal;  
H. R. 7779. An act for the relief of William H. Wagoner;  
H. R. 7992. An act for the relief of Sally Mattie Macready, widow of Edward Daniel Macready;  
H. R. 8092. An act for the relief of Randolph Sias;  
H. R. 8093. An act for the relief of John Rooks;  
H. R. 8190. An act for the relief of John G. Cassidy;  
H. R. 8370. An act for the relief of Jeremiah F. Mahoney;  
H. R. 8509. An act for the relief of Albert O. Tucker;  
H. R. 8574. An act for the relief of Thomas Murphy;  
H. R. 8589. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Nicholas;  
H. R. 8590. An act for the relief of Nicholas Jones;  
H. R. 8599. An act for the relief of George D. Vedder;  
H. R. 8627. An act for the relief of John Clark;  
H. R. 8628. An act for the relief of Amos Dahuff;  
H. R. 8643. An act for the relief of William Taylor Coburn;  
H. R. 8673. An act for the relief of Edward F. Weiskopf;  
H. R. 8674. An act for the relief of Lester Cooley;  
H. R. 8772. An act granting an annuity to Dr. Robert P. Cooke;  
H. R. 8775. An act for the relief of George P. Bailey;  
H. R. 8778. An act for the relief of William W. Woodruff;

H. R. 8788. An act to correct the military record of Willard Thompson, deceased;

H. R. 8796. An act for the relief of Martin L. Duffy;

H. R. 8797. An act for the relief of Clayton H. Adams;

H. R. 8798. An act for the relief of William Lentz;

H. R. 8804. An act for the relief of George W. McNeil;

H. R. 8805. An act for the relief of Martha D. McCune;

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution for the appointment of Paul E. Divine, of Tennessee, as member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; and

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for the relief of special disbursing agents of the Alaska Railroad.

#### THE TARIFF AND AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 52) submitted by Mr. McMASTER, favoring a reduction of tariff schedules and the consideration of tariff legislation at the present session of Congress.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the resolution offered by the junior Senator from South Dakota and which favors such revision of the tariff in this session of Congress as will afford a better balance as between great and powerful industry on the one hand and agriculture and smaller business enterprise on the other has provoked a most interesting debate.

The debate shows an awakening of the Senate to the real existence of a tremendous element of dissatisfaction throughout America—a dissatisfaction that promises a great element of misfortune for the political party which longer ignores the appeal for a new order that will find the favors of government showered alike upon all people and all sections of the country.

I shall not at this time argue with those who contend that the resolution is not choice at this time. I want only to say that it sounds and expresses clearly the frame of mind of that great element of our population residing upon farms and in communities which find their prosperity or adversity in agriculture. It is a frame of mind which statesmen recognize and which politicians had best contend if they would save the lives of their parties. These dissatisfied people are not going to listen to all the little niceties which can be uttered in support of the present tariff structure. They want a balance in the economic field, a balance which the present order makes impossible. They want and will demand that privileges afforded by the tariff be fairly distributed. They want and will demand that if industry shall be artificially propped up to a higher plane than all industry and labor shall be given equally favorable and helpful props. They want and demand a fair balance. How they get it does not matter much. If the only way remaining for them to win that fair balance is to pull all industry down onto the economic plane occupied by themselves they will not hesitate to use their influence to help pull industry off its high horse. That is what can fairly be expected if the present order is permitted to prevail.

Listening to the debate upon this question one finds that the opponents of the resolution are assuming the "leave-well-enough-alone" attitude. Leave things alone; do not rock the boat; do not upset the present order which is giving America the most brilliant days of her career!

I realize that it is most unpopular to differ with this contention that we are enjoying a greater prosperity to-day than ever before, but I can not see it to be much short of criminal to fool ourselves longer into the belief that all is well and just as it ought to be. There may be prosperity rampant in certain quarters, but to declare that prosperity is general is to declare falsely. The economic balance or lack of balance really existing is alarming to say the least, and is generally considered so by unprejudiced minds.

There has been called to my attention an editorial appearing in the current issue of the weekly paper known as Labor, which I am going to ask the Senate to listen to at this time:

Dr. William E. Dodd, one of the great historians of this country and professor of American history at the University of Chicago, spoke in Washington the other night on the question: "Shall American farmers become peasants?"

It was one of the sharpest challenges and warnings ever given from a responsible source in a Nation's Capital. Tillers of the soil in other ages and countries have been peasants, said Doctor Dodd; "dust feet," as the Greeks called them. Are ours doomed to the same fate? They seem headed that same way.

They have been "deflated" for the third time in American history, and they may not survive—as farmers, as exponents of the splendid rural civilization which has been the basis of our national life.

America began as a Nation of farmers, desperately in debt. The Napoleonic wars sent prices skyward, and the resulting prosperity

floated the new ship of state. When Napoleon was caged came the first great deflation. Prices of farm products dropped to half or a quarter what they had been. Other prices fell much less. Manufacturers got a tariff to help them; farmers got nothing; they went broke and went west by millions.

The Civil War and the years following repeated the process with hardly a change, except that the postwar tariff was higher. The World War did the same, save that there is no longer a west for the farmer to go to.

"Manufacturing has the tariff," said Doctor Dodd. "Transportation has the Esch-Cummins Act, and 5% per cent. Labor has restricted immigration—and I did all I could to help pass that immigration law. The farmer has nothing."

Secretary Mellon says that the country can not spare anything for farm relief—and in the same breath tells Congress to cut \$225,000,000 from the income tax. Our good Democrats in Congress—I am a Democrat—say that they will cut \$400,000,000 from the income tax; but where is relief for the farmer?"

Doctor Dodd gave a concrete instance of how the farmer is exploited. He has a farm and an orchard in Virginia.

Last year he sold his apples for 15 cents a barrel. He followed them to Washington, and found exactly similar apples selling at the rate of \$15 a barrel.

"What is the remedy?" asked Doctor Dodd. "I do not know; but I think one could be found. If I were a statesman responsible for the welfare of this country, I think I should find the remedy or commit suicide. I sometimes wonder if a good many of our public men want to find a remedy."

Farmers or peasants? That is the choice. Will history show that this grim warning, delivered by one of the Nation's great students, in the very shadow of the Capitol, was given in vain?

If we approach our work in Congress this winter in that frame of mind in which leaders would have us, we can not hope to accomplish the changes which are so essential. We are, I fear, for the most part in a wrong frame of mind to do anything really constructive.

We need more than anything else at this time to face the facts as they are and resolve to keep them in mind in our consideration of the many pressing problems before us.

But from every hand, to keep us in this wrong frame of mind, comes the cry of prosperity. It is claimed that everything is in splendid order and there is no cause whatever for complaint from any source.

It has been suggested to me in correspondence which I have had with one of my farmer constituents in North Dakota that it might be a splendid idea at this time, in view of the fact that there are a great many people wanting to know just where this thing which is called prosperity is, to call the marines from Nicaragua and put them to the task of locating prosperity here at home.

I have before me a great many newspaper clippings which I have collected during the last two or three weeks. I merely wish to call to the attention of the Senate some of their headings. Here is one:

Secretary Mellon declares business conditions stable.

And he goes on to show what a wonderfully prosperous year 1927 was and states that we may expect a continuation of that same state of affairs in 1928. "Speaker LONGWORTH," of the House, "finds prosperity in all quarters," according to another newspaper story.

During the Christmas season the Washington papers were filled with accounts of instances of unemployment and distress in the District of Columbia, here in the very shadow of the National Capitol, whence comes all of this boasting of our great national prosperity. We know that there were scores of individuals and of families right here in Washington needing aid, needing the help of charity, which was given so far as charity would permit; but yet it is claimed right here in Washington that we are living in an era of prosperity heretofore unknown to the Capital or to the Nation. Then came the cold spell during the Christmas holidays and with it came an announcement that—

An army of nearly 700 homeless and unemployed men besieged the city's charitable refuges, and that various institutions housed and fed the largest group of unfortunates seen here since the winter of 1917.

Reports from mission workers indicated that lodgings were being sought by shivering and hungry persons in virtually every section of the Capital.

And yet it is claimed we are in an era of the greatest prosperity the Nation has ever known.

In the Washington Times of January 2 one reads a like story. This clipping states:



From about noon yesterday, a portion of the army of unemployed began straggling into the Central Union Mission at 622 Louisiana Avenue NW. and the Gospel Mission at 214 John Marshall Place NW.

During the recent cold spell here the Gospel Mission used all its beds and other unfortunates slept upon the floor. Last year the Gospel Mission served 40,000 free meals for the hungry.

Again, I repeat, that occurred right here in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol and of the Treasury. How many more than the newspapers tell us are actually in dire need not only of food but of the other essentials of life no man can tell. I have before me a letter written to the New York World, and published in that newspaper under date of December 31 last, which indicates that perhaps there are thousands upon thousands of needy people yet maintaining a pride that denies them the freedom of calling upon the aid of charity. This gentleman writes:

If all the effort, money, and energy used to feed 50,000 hungry men in New York one day of the year were used to solve the problem of unemployment and fair wages, it would be a service rendered to the country a hundred times greater than all the charity organizations have ever accomplished. I have seen hundreds of young, strong, and honorable men walk the streets for three or four days without food, but they have not once accepted charity. These men have exhibited character and honor equal to the best. Charity seldom reaches this type.

And so it may be with thousands upon thousands in all sections of the United States to-day.

From the Baltimore Sun of December 23 comes the alarming information, at a time when prosperity is being preached to us, that an inquiry is to be made into unemployment. The total unemployment in the city of Baltimore at that time was placed at 75,000 and Henry F. Broening, president of the Baltimore Federation of Labor, asserted that the unemployment situation in Baltimore is worse than it was in 1921.

Many other newspaper clippings which are available show a similar condition to exist in other sections; but coming back to the city of Washington, we find the unemployment situation is regarded as wholly unsatisfactory. Yet it is said there is prosperity.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in 1927, the most prosperous year that this Nation has ever known, there were 135 failures of national banking institutions in the United States. In only one year during the last eight has there been a number of national bank failures exceeding that figure of 135.

According to Bradstreet's review of the 1927 situation, the security markets were enormous and speculation aided by easy bank credits swelled bank clearings and debits to new high levels, while the prices of stock and other exchange seats rose to levels taxing the imagination.

Business failures, according to Bradstreet's, last year were the second largest in history, and liabilities were the fourth largest on record in the history of this country.

Dun & Co. report failures in 1927 totaling 23,146, and claims of a larger number of failures than that have been made by others. However, the total which Dun & Co. report for 1927 were exceeded only by the totals of that terrible year 1922, and there was last year an increase in the sum total of liabilities.

Mr. President, I ask that this report by Dun & Co. may be incorporated in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NORRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times, January 4, 1928]

FAILURES IN 1927 PLACED AT 23,146—DUN & CO. REPORT INCREASE OF 6 PER CENT IN YEAR—20,265 ON BRADSTREET'S RECORD—BIGGER TOTALS ONLY IN 1922—GREATER RISE IN SUM OF LIABILITIES—BANKRUPTCIES IN DECEMBER NUMBERED 2,162

The number of commercial failures in the United States has risen for the fourth consecutive year. R. G. Dun & Co. report for 1927, exclusive of banking and other fiduciary suspensions, the total being 23,146 for the year, against 21,773 defaults in 1926, 21,214 two years ago, 20,615 in 1924, and 18,718 insolvencies in 1923, the low point since 1920.

Liabilities fared much worse than the numerical exhibit, Dun's reports, reaching \$520,104,268, and contrasting with \$409,200,000 in 1926 and \$443,700,000 in 1925, the increases over these two years being 27 and 18 per cent, respectively. The 1927 indebtedness, although large, falls below that for the four years immediately prior to 1925, and compares with a record high of \$627,400,000 in 1921, in which year the returns reflected sharply the economic readjustment which began to gather force in 1920. The annual figures, as compiled by Dun & Co., follow:

Year	Number	Assets	Liabilities
1927	23,146	\$256,739,633	\$520,104,268
1926	21,773	202,345,485	409,200,000
1925	21,214	248,066,570	443,700,000
1924	20,615	337,945,190	543,225,449
1923	18,718	388,382,154	539,386,806
1922	23,676	413,357,995	623,896,251
1921	19,652	409,033,316	627,400,000
1920	8,881	195,504,114	295,121,805
1919	6,451	67,037,843	113,291,237
1918	9,892	101,637,798	163,019,979
1917	13,855	103,464,805	182,441,371
1916	16,993	113,599,026	196,212,256
1915	22,156	83,453,785	302,286,148
1914	18,280	265,293,046	357,908,859
1913	16,037	174,688,151	272,672,288
1912	15,452	126,278,321	203,117,391
1911	13,441	124,516,544	191,061,665

There was an increase in December, in accordance with a seasonal trend, failures for the month numbering 2,162, or about 16 per cent above the number for November and 21 per cent above that in October. Failures numbered 2,069 in December last year. Liabilities in December were \$51,262,253, against \$36,100,000 in November and \$45,650,000 in December, 1926.

The total number of failures in the United States in 1927 reported to Bradstreet's was 20,265, and the total liabilities of those failing was \$654,282,367, an increase of 1.2 per cent in the number of failures as compared with 1926, but a decrease in liabilities from that year of one-tenth of 1 per cent. The failures in 1927 constituted the second largest total on record, but fell below those of the peak year 1922 by 9.6 per cent, while the liabilities were the fourth largest recorded, falling 13.3 per cent behind those of the peak year 1921.

Following are the failures, assets, liabilities, and the percentage of those in business failing in each year of the last decade as reported by Bradstreet's:

Year	No failures	Actual assets, millions	Total liabilities, millions	Per cent failing
1927	20,265	385.1	654.3	0.80
1926	20,024	379.7	655.2	.88
1925	18,859	261.7	479.6	.84
1924	19,712	419.7	694.8	.89
1923	19,159	399.1	631.1	.89
1922	22,415	365.6	649.8	1.08
1921	20,014	446.6	755.7	.97
1920	8,463	274.1	426.3	.43
1919	5,515	55.3	115.5	.29
1918	9,331	69.3	137.9	.51

Mr. NYE. The Department of Justice records that during the last year there were 48,758 bankruptcies, involving \$885,557,000, or \$80,000,000 more than during 1926 and half a billion dollars more than 10 years ago.

We find that the condition of some of the more powerful banking institutions, located primarily in the city of New York, evidences an element of prosperity.

Under date of January 4, 1928, the New York Times declares that the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York enjoyed last year an increase of \$1,077,739 in profits, which figure does not include, mind you, the \$5,000,000 transferred to the surplus account during that year.

The Bowery and East River National Bank, of New York, showed undivided profits last year of \$11,320,221 as against \$6,574,545 the year previous.

The International Acceptance Bank transacted a greater volume of business in 1927 than in any previous year during its establishment; and, according to this story in the Times, after six years of operation it now reports total assets of \$130,591,971, an increase of \$24,969,891, or 23½ per cent since the close of 1926.

So I might go on further to show the increase in business transactions by the banks of the country during 1927.

Another newspaper, the Christian Science Monitor, in its issue of December 31, relates the high levels reached by financing in America in 1927, and here is a very interesting paragraph therefrom:

Bond financing, like total financing, for 1927 stands out as an all-time record, the figures in this class alone overtopping the total of stock and bond financing combined for 1926. The 1927 volume of bond financing was approximately \$7,750,000,000. This is a 27 per cent increase over 1926 and a 47 per cent increase over the previous five-year average.

Indicating that whatever element of prosperity exists in any material order to-day is found only in those institutions which

are dealing in the fluctuating values of stocks and bonds in this country.

According to the New York State Industrial Commission there were 643,000 men and women in the State of New York out of work last December, and 3,000,000 in the United States are declared to be out of work; and yet we call this an era of prosperity, boast of our prosperity, and every agency of the Government to-day is at work to sell this program of prosperity to the people of the country.

I have in my hand a copy of the Industrial, Agricultural, and General Employment Prospects for 1928, a bulletin issued by the United States Department of Labor. In the flyleaf of this document I find this very interesting explanation by Francis I. Jones, director general of the bureau.

Contrary—

He says—

to precedent established in former presidential election years, when the business world stood by waiting results before charting their programs, the opposite is true at this time. A careful perusal of this bulletin will disclose the important information that industry and business will mark new high levels in 1928.

The pessimists—

I want the Senate to hear this—

The pessimists, doubting Thomases, and the iconoclasts will be obliged to revise their opinions with respect to the Nation's industrial future.

And so one is scored who dares picture the real situation which prevails in this country to-day. The departments of the Government are giving over their literature to a condemnation of those who will not agree that in this day and age we are enjoying that measure of prosperity to which all people are entitled.

They say that business is prosperous in a general way. John Edgarton, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, addressing the annual convention of this association last October, used this language:

Outside the few gigantic corporations which do not have to bother about competition, and by whose large profits the public is misled, the common run of manufacturers in America to-day are in about as unhappy a condition as their fellow producers the farmers; and I challenge those who will overturn that statement.

That statement can not be overturned. Statistics disclose that Mr. Edgarton knew of what he was talking.

According to the income-tax returns, 40 per cent, or 200,000 of the manufacturing corporations of this country, lost money in the last reported year. Forty per cent of all corporations doing business in this country lost money! Is that prosperity? The corporations number 430,072. Of that number, one-twentieth of 1 per cent gathered in 40 per cent of the total profits of all corporations for that one year.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. NYE. I do.

Mr. McLEAN. Does the Senator believe that the unfortunate condition of 40 per cent of these corporations is due to the fact that tariff rates are too high?

Mr. NYE. I would not put it in just that language; but I do believe that their continued adversity is attributable to the fact that we have a tariff law which in words declares itself to be in the interest of agriculture, which contains schedules in the interest of agriculture, but which the Congress of the United States declines to give the farmers the advantage of through failure to enact that legislation which will make effective the tariff which has been written in support of agriculture.

Mr. McLEAN. I understand; but the Senator has no knowledge that the unfortunate condition of these corporations is due to the fact that the present tariff rates are too high.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McMASTER. I should like to propound a question to the junior Senator from North Dakota. Is it not a fact that the large percentage of those corporations which are in a serious condition at the present time are operating throughout the agricultural West?

Mr. NYE. I think that is entirely true.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As a matter of fact, the corporations that find themselves in distress as a rule are the smaller corporations, manufacturers, and so forth, are they not?

Mr. NYE. That is true.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is quite possible that an explanation can be found in the statement made by Roger Babson at Omaha, I think, on the 25th day of May, in which he said we were evidently entering upon an epoch in which the big fellow is eating the little fellow. The little, independent manufacturer or merchant is "on the skids." He is being eaten up by the big fellow. I think that will explain it to some extent. I think that is true; but what I have never been able to understand is that the little fellow seems to like it.

Mr. NYE. I thank the Senator for that explanation.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, does the Senator remember what Mr. Babson said with regard to the pending proposal for agricultural relief? Does the Senator remember Mr. Babson's suggestion as to what should be done by the Congress to aid the farmer?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Oh, yes; I remember it very well. I will state it if the Senator will permit me. He advised the farmers of the Northwest to go to Washington and camp on the coat tails of Congress.

Mr. McLEAN. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think he was wrong. I think he should have said they should go to Washington and camp on the coat tails of the President.

Mr. McLEAN. But not to secure a reduction of the tariff, if I remember correctly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not remember that statement.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HOWELL. I think Mr. Babson also stated that he would advise the young men in the West to get out unless conditions improved. I am speaking about the young men on the farms.

Mr. McLEAN. That is not germane to the question which I propounded.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, did he tell them where to go?

Mr. HOWELL. To get into big business.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. In California?

Mr. HOWELL. I assume so. There is a good deal of big business in California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. There is, indeed—fine business.

Mr. HOWELL. And it can accommodate them.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. A long time ago we had a great many people who went from Iowa to California. We have not anybody in Iowa now who has money enough to go to California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The most progressive, the most intelligent, and, if I may say it, the most splendid of your people have come to California, and they are all prosperous there. I know that Iowa, my native State, needs relief. I will hereafter point out the kind of relief I think she needs.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, one-fourth of 1 per cent of all corporations doing business in America in this one year took 60 per cent of the profits of all corporations. The net profits of all corporations in that one year were \$7,500,000,000. Sixty-six per cent of this, remember, went to one-fourth of 1 per cent of all corporations, or to 1,000 corporations. One thousand corporations, then, were the recipients of \$5,000,000,000 of the \$7,500,000,000 of profits enjoyed by all of the corporations doing business in America in that one year; and it is interesting at this point to note this comparison:

Here are 1,000 big corporations in America enjoying an annual profit of approximately \$5,000,000,000, while the entire revenue, not profit, of the one-third of our population engaged in agriculture does not total quite twice the profits of that mere handful of corporations.

We know of the 10 per cent wage reduction in the textile industry. We know of the unwholesome condition existing in the mining industry. We know of the tremendous increase in criminal proceedings before the courts of our country. We know of the increase in bankruptcies and foreclosures. Yet, Mr. President, in spite of all of these facts, we still are persuaded to believe that we ought to march right in line with



those whose banner reads, "The most prosperous era in all American history." We know of the orgy which has taken place upon the stock and bonds market; and, if that spells prosperity, then, of course, I must agree with those who contend to-day that this is a wonderful era of prosperity.

No! Business, little business, the smaller business corporations in this country, do not know where to find that thing called prosperity. Likewise, the American farmer is pretty hard pressed to find it possible to say that his condition is satisfactory; that he is satisfied to leave things just as they are; that he is asking no changes here, there, or anywhere; that he is going to work his own way out of this difficulty all right. The fact of the matter is that the farmer finds himself to-day in a position where it is questionable in his mind whether he is going to be found following his industry in that particular quarter to-morrow.

According again to Federal census figures, 29.9 per cent of the people of the United States are living upon and are dependent upon the farms; and yet that virtually 30 per cent are enjoying only 8 per cent of the current national income. In the last six years the American farmers have lost in capital stock \$20,000,000,000. The exchange value of their farm lands has decreased \$4,000,000,000. Farm indebtedness in the last 15 years has increased from four to twelve billions of dollars; and for the products for which the farmer in 1925 received \$10,000,000,000 the American consumer paid \$30,000,000,000, or three times what the farmer received.

It is true that farm prices have increased during this period following the war. It is all very true. They have increased 26 per cent; but the increase in farm-living costs has not stopped at 26 per cent, but has gone on to 68 per cent.

Likewise in the case of taxes: Farm taxes have increased 112 per cent. Farm-building costs have increased 102 per cent. The freight rates on grain have virtually doubled since the war. Where it cost on the average \$45 prior to the war to ship a carload of hogs to market, to-day it costs \$130.

Then, following still further in the Federal census figures, we find there was an increase since 1914 of only 10,000 farms operated in the United States; yet of the total of farms operated in the United States in 1925 there were 80,000 less farm owners than there were in 1914, and there were 100,000 more tenants operating the farm lands of the United States than in 1914.

It is very interesting, too, to note that while in 1925 there was more livestock in the country than in 1914, its value was less by considerable than the value placed upon the lesser amount in 1914; and the value of livestock in 1925 was only half what it was in 1920.

I want to call to the attention of the Senate the situation in my own State; and what I say of the situation there I think is equally true of the situation prevailing in every other great agricultural State to-day.

We have there a situation which discloses that an increase of 50 cents in the price of a bushel of wheat would mean to every family in the State of North Dakota an increase of \$500 with which to carry on their lives, and yet North Dakota is not dependent upon wheat alone, for the value of our dairy products is thirteen times greater than is the value of our wheat crop.

While the contributions of North Dakota may be small in comparison with those of other States, nevertheless some of its contributions are a matter which the people of this country must recognize, for we are producing there one-third of all the flax produced in the United States, two-fifths of all the spring wheat, and one-fifth of all the wheat produced in the United States. No State is producing more rye and more barley than we are in North Dakota; only seven States produce more potatoes; and yet in North Dakota there exists at this time a situation which makes it impossible for anyone to stand up and declare that this is a prosperous era and get away with it.

A few weeks ago I had occasion to discuss our agricultural problem before an audience in New York, and through a very unfair representation given to that interview and address in New York, some of the people in my State have felt constrained to declare that I was grossly misrepresenting the State of North Dakota. From one newspaper, the Grand Forks Herald, comes an editorial clipping under the title "Libeling North Dakota." I shall read at this time the first paragraph:

In a recent address in New York Senator Nye, of North Dakota, told his audience that the farmers of North Dakota are worse off than they were four or five years ago, that tenant farming in the State is increasing at an alarming rate, and that six banks out of eight in one county had gone into receivership in three days.

In the main, that is what I did say. I did not say that the condition was worse than it was at any time before the war, but

I did say that I did not believe there was any material improvement over the situation which prevailed in 1920 and 1921. But there is an element of pride, of course, in every State, and anyone who ventures to say that things in his State are not as they ought to be, and who tells the truthness of the situation which does prevail there, is subject to a charge of disloyalty to his State in certain minds. For my own part, however, I can not see how agriculture is ever going to be restored to that balance to which it is entitled until the people of this country are awakened to the real situation which does prevail, and they are not going to be awakened to that situation so long as we, as representatives of those people first concerned, sit back and swallow without a gulp, even, these stories, and admit that we are living in an age of wonderful prosperity.

The tenor of the people who object toward those who go out and tell the truth about conditions is indicated in a further paragraph in this same editorial:

Mr. Nye has grossly misrepresented North Dakota in this address, and the misrepresentation is none the less because of the possible accuracy of the figures which he quotes, and none the less injurious on that account.

In other words, I may be telling the truth, but am telling things that should not be told, and ought to keep quiet in order that we may get some more people into North Dakota, put them out on these vast areas of the State which have been vacated during these last few years—help those who have been overburdened with land through foreclosures and through forfeitures which have been made during this period of depression—get them on to that land, and with what happens to them after that we are not concerned. But let us unload this land.

Mr. President, I think we ought to start on a firmer foundation. I think we ought to start out and establish agriculture in such a fashion that it will offer to that man who will properly and fairly exercise himself toward the labor which a farm calls for at least a small chance of making his effort count for something. Until that time I think it a terrible mistake on the part of any individual to seek to plant in the minds of any people the thought that things are wonderfully improved in agricultural America and that the opportunity is ripe now for people who want to go to farming to undertake it at this particular time.

These editorials which have been published along that line have brought to me a great lot of correspondence from people who are differing with the editorial criticism which is offered. Just one letter do I want to read indicating the general tenor of the thought of the people:

Mr. Nye: I am inclosing an editorial taken from the Minto Journal which bears reference to your speech in New York. I for one agree with you, as I have come in contact with a larger number of farmers than Mr. Mitchell, who is responsible for this editorial, and I am here to tell you that the majority of farmers claim that farming has been a losing proposition for the last number of years.

Mr. Mitchell does not remember that almost every town in this county has had a bank failure this fall—

Let me remark here, Senators, that in that county they had a fair crop this year; and yet, in spite of it, these bank failures continue. I read further from the letter:

We have had four bank failures within a radius of 18 miles within the last month. If the editor will only stop a few moments to review the cause of this, I am sure he will find that the farmers and farming have contributed a great deal to the financial downfall of these institutions. I presume Mr. Mitchell would like for you to paint an illusive picture before an eastern audience depicting the State of North Dakota as a great cornucopia, while in reality it should almost be assigned to the rôle of a sick man, as I figure its basic industry (agriculture) is a sickening proposition and has almost sapped the morals of those engaged in it. The elements which the farmer has to contend with are high prices of machinery, high cost of labor, high transportation charges, while in turn he receives a low price for his grain, and the purchasing power of his dollar is low enough.

I contend, Mr. President, that no agricultural State in this Union will come back more quickly, will get on its feet more quickly, than will North Dakota if agriculture is given half a chance to make its efforts count for some reasonable return.

The claim has been made during this debate, and made repeatedly—at least it has been insinuated—that the enhanced land values during the war brought about a condition which we have to expect and must accept as being the only thing that naturally could follow now. It is said that if values went up during the war that they have to come down eventually, and now is the time that they must come down. But, Mr. President, in my own State of North Dakota land values were not enhanced during the war period by one single, solitary penny.

They were not inflated out there as they were in some other States.

I merely recite this to indicate that there were States where there was no land boom during the war, but where the situation prevailing to-day is virtually as serious as it is in those States where land values did mount to proportions that virtually were out of sight.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. McLEAN. What was the reason why land values did not rise in your State?

Mr. NYE. I am delighted to explain that to the Senator. I think one man was more responsible than any other, as the story is told, for the good fortune that was visited upon North Dakota during the war period, that found our land values not enhanced. That one individual is none other than my colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER]. During that war period North Dakota was the one State in the Union which was really not a part of the Union. We were a lot of bolsheviks out there, so they said. We were trying to solve our problems within the State. We were establishing State industries that were going to take care of the products we were producing in abundance, and give the producer a greater proportion of that margin which existed between his return and the price paid by the consumer.

In opposition to this program there came every powerful industry and every powerful influence in this country, to the end that credit was injured to such an extent, in so far as North Dakota was concerned, that we could not float, we could not sell, through the ordinary channels in this country, the bonds which were offered by the State of North Dakota to establish those industries.

A false impression went out as to our purpose, of the purpose of these honest and hard-working and seriously engaged people of North Dakota. The impression went out that those farmers were a dangerous lot of people, that North Dakota's credit was being wrecked, that it would be unsafe to make any investments in lands in North Dakota. The result was that we went through that period without any enhanced land values, and I think no one is more to be thanked for that than the Nonpartisan League, which was so severely criticized at that time, and to some degree criticized since.

Mr. McLEAN. Your wheat acreage was increased considerably out there, was it not?

Mr. NYE. Our wheat acreage was increased, and I am going to touch upon that a little later on.

The Minneapolis Journal, in connection with this objection to my disclosing the truths which exist in agricultural America, asks me this question publicly:

In the light of these figures, Senator, did you do the fair thing toward North Dakota when you let your hearers go away with the impression that things were going from bad to worse on farms that have just produced the second most valuable crop in all their history?

There is the situation, Mr. President. They have produced their second most valuable crop in North Dakota in all history, and yet, in spite of this, there are continued bank failures, there are continued bankruptcies, there are continued foreclosures and forfeitures of lands, because under the existing order the farmer is not receiving for that which he is producing a return which will compensate him for the labor and for the costs involved in the producing of that thing. It amounts virtually to this: That the more a farmer produces to-day, the worse off he is.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. NORBECK. I was not in the Chamber during the early part of the Senator's speech and it was not my pleasure to hear that part of it. I wondered whether the Senator went into the causes of the depreciation of the farmer's dollar; and if so, what his views are on that point.

Mr. NYE. I have not yet done so, but I fully plan to.

In my own State of North Dakota see what has occurred since the war. There were less farms in 1925, according to the Federal census, than there were in 1910. Where in 1910, 17 years ago, with our resources hardly scratched, with the whole future before us, we had 44,000 farm owners in the State of North Dakota, 15 years later found us not with 44,000 full farm owners, but with only 26,000 farm owners. Where 1910 found us with only 10,000 tenants, 1925 found us with 26,000 tenants, or as many tenants as we had full farm owners in 1925.

The value of farm property in North Dakota was decreased by half a billion, decreased from one and a half billion dollars to practically a billion dollars, since 1920. There was more

livestock in North Dakota in 1925 than there was in 1910, and a much better grade of livestock. Yet it is found to be, according to the Federal enumeration, worth less money than was that lesser amount in 1910.

The worth of all farm lands and buildings in North Dakota in 1925 was fixed by the Federal census at \$200,000,000. That means the values held by so-called farm owners in North Dakota. But to what extent are they really farm owners? Against this valuation of \$200,000,000 there exists to-day a mortgage debt of \$82,000,000, or that was what existed in 1925. I know the odds are greater to-day. In other words, 41 per cent of the values held by so-called full farm owners in 1925 in that one agricultural State are mortgaged. Yet we call them full farm owners, according to the Federal census.

What is the cause of this difficulty confronting agriculture to-day? I do not think I will go to any length in discussing that or to do more than repeat what I have already said. The American farmer can go on from now until doomsday producing as he has never produced before, making two blades grow where one grew before, increasing his production on every hand; but, Mr. President, no matter to what ends he goes in that effort, he is going to find himself still on the small end when it comes to balancing up accounts, because so long as men produce and must sell that which they produce for less than the cost of production, there can not be any end other than the eventual decay of that industry which those individuals are following, and unless there can be favors alike upon all the people, where there are favors to be bestowed by the Government, we sound indeed the danger signal.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am very much interested in the address of the Senator. I would be very glad to have him tell us whom he includes under the term "farmer." I do not put the question idly, or to engage in a quibble over words, but I want to know whom he includes under the term "farmer" when he speaks of the farmers of a given State.

Mr. NYE. Of a given State?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes; within the State of North Dakota or the State of Minnesota or Montana or California or Florida. What is the figure?

Mr. NYE. I labor under the assumption that from a Federal standpoint anyone can be considered a farmer whom the Federal census has considered to be among the 29.9 per cent of the people who are resident upon the agricultural lands of the country.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Does that include stock raising and dairying in all its branches?

Mr. NYE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It would not include mining?

Mr. NYE. No; not mining.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Men engaged in getting something out of the soil of the earth?

Mr. NYE. Tilling the soil, producing from the soil that which the people must have.

What is it that happened to agriculture? A few days ago the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE]—I wish he were in the Chamber now—yes; I see he is in the Chamber—remarked on the floor of the Senate, and he spoke, I think, honest convictions that the whole difficulty confronting agriculture to-day is that occasioned by the fact of inflation during the war, that farm land values had been inflated during the war period and that the farmer had to expect eventually to come down off of that high plane. I think the Senator was thoroughly honest in his assumption that that was the truth of the situation. I think from what I have said here this afternoon that I have disclosed that in the case of at least one State inflated land values contributed nothing to the cause, because there were no inflated land values.

What really happened was this, Mr. President: The war came on, and the Government, this Government, this Congress, the administration at that time, urged the farmer to devote himself to the task of producing more food. He could not produce too much of it; he was assured of that. Then, though he was minus the ordinary help that he had upon his farm, though his sons had been drafted in the service and carried across the seas to conduct the war, he reached out and during that period of high labor prices engaged expensive help. He bought additional expensive, high-priced machinery, machinery which had gone up in price during that period. He did all of that during that period. He bought it because his country urged him to do it. During the period of the war, with all credit to the boys who carried the real brunt of that service, do not overlook the fact that one who contributed very materially to our success in the war was none other than the farmer of America. Not only did he sustain and back up his own



Army, his own boys, but he backed up and sustained virtually every army that was engaged in that war on the side of the Allies.

The farmer engaged during that war in a most desperate undertaking. He left no stone unturned to respond to the appeal by his Government to produce more food. Then came the end of the war, and with the end of the war came a warning within the farmer: "Here, we have had these big years, and we can not expect them to continue. Now, with the war over, we will have to slow up. We had better do some liquidating. We had better get back to normalcy as all people must following a war." But with that warning in his mind the Government of the United States, through its spokesmen, advised the farmer that for years and years to come he was going to have to feed the world; that he could keep right on producing; that he must in all fairness keep right on producing as he had been producing during the war.

With that assurance, and in spite of the limitations which were placed upon him and the comparatively low prices he had had for his products during the war—in spite of all that he continued to respond to that appeal by his Government to produce and continue to produce more food. He carried on to a certain point. What was that point?

He found himself one afternoon going along splendidly. He found himself on the next morning virtually, if not completely, out of the economic picture altogether. What had happened was that here in Washington there gathered a mere handful of men determined that the most essential thing concerning America at that time was the thing of driving America back to normalcy, and that the way to do it was to reduce credit. The way to do it was to withdraw the vast amount of credit which had been extended by the Federal reserve system during that period. So, Mr. Banker, out on the plains and out on the prairies and out in agricultural America generally, had nothing other to do to redeem himself for the easy credit of which he availed himself during the war than to turn to those to whom he had loaned money during the war period. He went to the farmer and explained that the demand was made upon him for repayment of the credit which had been extended during the war. The farmer said, "I suppose I have got to respond, then." So he liquidated as best he could. He had not enough to clean up his indebtedness contracted while he was responding to the prayers of his Government for help during the war time. And so—but some things are perhaps better unsaid, and I think I shall leave that unsaid.

In any event the farmer went back home, took whatever crop was available, and hauled it into market, took it there with the hope and in the expectation that with the return from that crop he could liquidate the greater portion of his debt. He got into a market that had lost its bottom, because that deflation movement had virtually ended the market and killed it, since every farmer in America was dumping his produce upon the market at that time in order that he might liquidate. After all was said and done, after the farmer had moved all his stuff and all his products into the market, he was still way short of being able to liquidate his indebtedness. Then went the equities in the land which he had bought during the war to help his Uncle Sam. Away went the equities in the land. In many cases, in hundreds upon hundreds of cases, there went at the same time the homestead which for 30 and 40 years had been without incumbrance and which, through the sweat of the man and his wife and his children, had been counted by them at one time as their home. But the home went as the result of that deflation program of 1920 and 1921. But that was not the end of it. During that period there was written by all odds the blackest page in all American history.

During the period of the war, when the farmer and all others were doing their utmost to prosecute the war, the urge came to help to finance the war. Few were the farmers who did not respond to the appeal which was made by the Government and by the bankers to buy until it hurt of Liberty loan bonds. Credit was made so easy that the bankers could say, "Here, you do not need to worry about the price of these. Just give us your note for the bond and you can clean it up after a while. That bond you must feel and can always know is as good as gold in your possession any day. You never need worry about that. You can always liquidate a bond indebtedness of that kind. It never need give you any worry."

But in that deflation program, when the stock of the farmer and the grain and the extra land bought during the war and the homestead were not enough to liquidate, then Mr. Farmer went into the bank and into the safe-deposit vault and took out the bonds which he had bought during the war, which he had more often than not borrowed money to possess, and took it to the cashier's window and said, "Here, apply these on my indebtedness." Mr. Banker during that period said to him, "I am

awfully sorry, but I suppose you are well aware of the fact that we can not give you 100 cents on the dollar for this bond." "What? A Government bond, a Liberty loan bond, and I can not have what I paid for it, to say nothing about the interest?" "No; I am sorry, but the market for Liberty bonds is only 75 or 80 or 85 cents."

My friends, that was by all odds the blackest page ever written in all American history, and yet to-day, while the Government of the United States is responsible for the hole in which the farmer finds himself, this same Government declines to give to him that measure of aid which he needs to save himself from further decay. When he asks that a life buoy be thrown out to him, the Congress of the United States or the administration offers instead to throw him an anchor, and that has been the situation for the last four or five years. I insist that if we are to continue to deny to the agricultural people of America that measure of help to which they are entitled, that measure of help which they must have if they are to be saved, if we longer deny that to them we are going to pay the penalty as a nation. The Nation will not pay the penalty prior to the penalty which political parties must pay for longer ignoring the situation.

Upon this particular day, and though I am not affiliated with that party which honors his day, Jackson Day, I want to read to the Senate a quotation attributed to Andrew Jackson:

It is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes. Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth can not be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law, but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant title, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers—who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their Government. There are no necessary evils in government. Its evils exist only in its abuses. If it would confine itself to equal protection, and, as heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and the low, the rich and the poor, it would be an unqualified blessing.

To that might be added the suggestion that if the Government would confine itself to equal protection and, as heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and low, the rich and the poor, the East and the West, the North and the South, it would be an unqualified blessing. But instead of seeking to give such a fair distribution of favors of the Government here in this country, we continue to ignore the fact that the blessings are all against certain endeavors in the country and all in favor of a very few. In spite of the situation which confronts the country to-day in the matter of unemployment in the great industry of agriculture and the smaller manufacturing and business industries, we are being preached to day after day that this is the most wonderful era of prosperity any nation has ever enjoyed.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McLEAN. I am very much interested in President Jackson's pronouncement, especially with regard to the portion which says that heaven showers its rains equally upon all alike. Is that quite true?

Mr. NYE. I expect that literally it is not.

Mr. McLEAN. Has not the Senator had experiences in North Dakota of a good many—

Mr. NYE. Not the experiences which are generally believed to be true. Some sections of our State do not have as great proportion of rain as others.

Mr. McLEAN. While it falls equally on the just and unjust, it does not fall equally on different portions of the United States, and because of that, and I think possibly other causes, my information is that the Dakota lands do not produce as large an average number of bushels per acre of wheat as some other sections of the country.

Mr. NYE. I think there is no section in the United States that produces a greater abundance per acre of hard wheat than does my State of North Dakota.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator ought to know, but my information is that during the war the acreage of wheat in North Dakota was greatly extended.

Mr. NYE. It was.

Mr. McLEAN. And that in many portions of the State the production was less than 10 bushels to the acre.

Mr. NYE. I will say to the Senator that it is true that during the period of the World War we were most unfortunate in

North Dakota, striving as the farmers were to respond to the appeal for more foodstuffs. There was a great spread out of farming endeavor, much greater acreage was put in, and the price that was made available at that time was a thing which all were seeking, of course; and yet during that particular period we were most unfortunate in our weather conditions in North Dakota.

Mr. McLEAN. Yes; that is the point I want to bring out. But the Senator would not hold Congress responsible for that?

Mr. NYE. But, Mr. President, what was true in North Dakota in that respect was not true in the other States which are complaining more bitterly, possibly, than North Dakota complains to-day about conditions. Iowa came through consistently with crops during that period, and portions of my own State came through consistently with good crops.

Mr. McLEAN. The point I want to bring out, I will say to the Senator, is the fact that President Jackson was wrong in his declaration that all sections of the country are favored with sufficient rainfall; and, that being so, Congress ought to come to the front and equal, if not exceed, Providence in extending assistance.

Mr. NYE. Virtually all sections of the country get at least a sprinkle once in a while, and in so far as the Government is concerned if it would just let a little sprinkle filter out to the masses of the people of this country there might be some reason to offer thanks.

Mr. McLEAN. We have as yet discovered no way by which we can add to the rainfall of the country.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, I assume that the principal rainfall in the State of Connecticut comes from the tariff system.

Mr. McLEAN. What I should like to know is just what effect the tariff has in its influence upon the deplorable condition from which the farmers insist they are now suffering. I am not saying this in a spirit of criticism at all; I know that environment has a great deal to do with political conviction. I am willing to confess it so far as I am concerned. We have here to-day at least three separate and distinct schools on the tariff question. I think it is important to ascertain who is right, if possible, and what effect the tariff has on the conditions in the agricultural sections.

Up to date there has not been indicated, so far as my observation goes, a single fact that would satisfy an impartial tribunal that any of the tariff rates are too high; that is, that they exceed the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

Mr. NYE. Yes; but we do find a very determined presentation here of the claim that, while there may not come from certain sources a demand for lowering of tariff schedules, there has been, and has been for a number of years, a repeated demand made for making effective those schedules which have been written into the tariff law but which are not effective to-day for the farmer.

Mr. McLEAN. To just what schedules now does the Senator refer?

Mr. NYE. Take the wheat schedule; take the splendid protection afforded wheat through the tariff; it does not mean a penny to the wheat producer in the United States. In my State of North Dakota, on the border of the Canadian line, there would be the opportunity, if there were not trade restrictions or barriers of any kind, for the North Dakota farmer living in the United States of America to take his load of wheat into Canada and get more money for it than he can obtain in the United States.

Mr. McLEAN. Admitting all that, how will it help the wheat producer to reduce the tariff duties on industrial products to a degree that will permit an influx of foreign goods? That is the point.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, I assume that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] all have a bearing upon this particular resolution. Now, I wish to ask the Senator this question: If, in his judgment, there were excessive schedules in the present tariff system would he vote to reduce those schedules?

Mr. McLEAN. No; not at this session.

Mr. McMASTER. But would he vote to reduce them?

Mr. McLEAN. Of course, I would do so when the tariff should be revised.

Mr. McMASTER. In other words, then, the Senator from Connecticut agrees with this resolution—

Mr. McLEAN. Oh, no.

Mr. McMASTER. That if there are excessive schedules they should be reduced, and he would vote to reduce them. That is the fundamental part of the resolution. The only difference between the Senator from Connecticut and those who are supporting the resolution is that he does not want to interfere with the interests of political parties at this time, but that later on he is willing to reduce the tariff schedules.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator, at least, ought to make out a prima facie case that there is one schedule that is excessive before he calls upon the Congress of the United States to reduce the tariff. We all know what tariff revision means. I do not now wish to discuss the tariff question, but I have been through two tariff revisions, and I know what tariff revision means. In the last revision we had some 40 experts who labored diligently for more than four months to try to ascertain the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, and I want to say to the Senator that in no single instance did the Committee on Finance approve a rate in excess of the evidence which was produced before the committee indicating the difference between the cost of producing the article at home and abroad.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what evidence was presented to the Committee on Finance of the Senate to justify the committee in establishing the schedules upon aluminum products? I have gone carefully through the testimony of the Finance Committee, and I fail to find there any evidence that was presented to that committee, at least in open session, that would justify the rates which were accorded to aluminum products.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, if this colloquy is going to be prolonged, I should like within two or three minutes to close what I have to say.

Mr. McLEAN. I think the Senator from North Dakota is right about that; I think he is entitled to finish his address, I am very glad, however, that the Senator from South Dakota brought up the question of aluminum.

Mr. NYE. If the Senator from Connecticut wishes briefly to answer the question of the Senator from South Dakota, I would certainly let him incorporate his answer right now in my remarks.

Mr. McLEAN. I prefer to do it later; but I will say that the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] yesterday called attention to the tariff rates on aluminum, and I think he made an estimate as a climax to his speech that on an article costing something like \$4.50 which his wife had purchased the tariff tax was considerably more than \$2. I want to say now that I think it is to be regretted that a United States Senator when he discusses a subject of this importance should not take the trouble to attempt at least to secure information that will enable him to discuss it without advertising the fact that he is absolutely ignorant of the subject. I will undertake in my own time to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the tax estimated by the Senator from New York is more than double the amount that the facts will warrant.

Mr. NYE. Very well, Mr. President. As I said at the outset, I did not wish to undertake at this time to argue with those who contend that the resolution before us is not choice at this particular time, but I wanted only to say that it sounded and expressed the attitude of a great mass of our population in America to-day who, seeing, day after day and year after year, a great flow of prosperity into a few individual corners to a few powerful corporations, while they themselves are left without a chance, seemingly, to make their best efforts win them a reasonably fair return for their endeavor, are not going to stop to quibble about any little niceties and about the fine words that may be said in support of certain schedules in the tariff law, but they are going to seek that means of elevating themselves to the higher plane which protected industry enjoys. They are going to be quite blind to anything else, I might say to the Senator, and are going to be determined, as a last resort, to tear down the props that will bring all industry down to a plane which is occupied to-day, I think I am safe in saying, by a majority of the people of the United States.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, has the Senator ever given consideration to what the effect of that program would be upon the 40 per cent of the Dakota farmers whose farms are mortgaged?

Mr. NYE. I have. Mr. President, I do not think, come what may, that the farmers of North Dakota or of any other agricultural State in the Union can be deflated or injured any more than they are injured right now. For the most part, the farmer retains so small an equity in comparison to the whole value of his property that he is really not seriously concerned,



unless he can be given a chance to come back. I can see dangers along the path of a program which might find us destroying the structure which has been erected in this country, but I believe that any amending of the tariff that is undertaken must be undertaken gradually; must be accomplished very slowly and cautiously. However, I am speaking now for people who are not much concerned about anything but their own condition.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, that reminds me of the days in the eighties when the farmers were just as certain that greenbacks would remedy their troubles as they are certain now that a cut in the tariff will remedy their troubles. Then in the nineties they were just as certain that the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 was the specific for their disease. But saner counsels prevailed. I do not quite believe the Senator from North Dakota wants to engage in an endeavor that will bring disaster to all the American people. He must know that when prices are cut in two the debts of the debtor class are doubled; the national debt is doubled, and the mortgage of every Dakota farmer is doubled. Those mortgages are not reduced; interest on those mortgages is not reduced; but it would take 2 bushels of wheat to raise the same amount of money that 1 bushel of wheat would raise before; and if we should double the production of wheat in this country I am afraid the Senator would have some difficulty in stabilizing the price, even if Congress were unanimous in its sympathy with him.

Mr. NYE. Very well; but the Senator will agree, then, that if these dire things are in store for us, if there is to be undertaken a program which will bring that about, we had better devote ourselves to satisfying the demand which does exist to-day for making effective the tariff upon all people alike.

Mr. McLEAN. O Mr. President—

Mr. NYE. If there is a tariff schedule which is not operative as to the great mass of the people of this country it had better be made effective.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator must realize that the spread between the retail price of an article and the price which the manufacturer receives is so wide that the tariff has little to do with the cost or the price to the consumer, and he himself must realize that he is on the wrong track entirely when he thinks that the reduction of tariff rates below a reasonable protection will benefit the farmer. The price of wheat can not be pulled down faster than by reducing the purchasing power of the men and women who eat wheat.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McMASTER. All of the opponents of this resolution assume that the rates are to be cut so low that industry is to be injured, that labor is to be thrown out of employment. That is not the proposition back of this resolution. The resolution starts out with an assumption of fact that there are certain excessive schedules, and if the excessive schedules shall be reduced it will increase the purchasing power of the masses. If it is true that there are excessive schedules, and those excessive schedules shall be reduced, will that not increase the purchasing power of the farmer?

Mr. McLEAN. But before we engage in this dangerous operation, let us ascertain the facts.

Mr. McMASTER. The only way to ascertain the facts is to pass the resolution, start the tariff revision, and have your investigation.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, we already have a law by which—

Mr. McMASTER. No; if we wait for tariff revision to find out any of those things it will be a thousand years before we can have tariff revision.

Mr. McLEAN. The law to-day provides that the tariff on any one of these articles can be cut 50 per cent provided you can satisfy the Tariff Commission that the cut is legitimate—that is, that the existing tariff exceeds the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. Is there any evidence here that one single effort has been made, one single appeal has been brought to that commission to ascertain whether or not a rate is excessive?

All the law you need under any circumstances you have. You say it will not operate. You do not know whether it will or not, because you have not tried. Certainly you ought to be willing to trust the instrumentalities of this Government to a sufficient extent to attempt to apply a law that will give you absolute relief if it is justified.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, we may get relief from the Tariff Commission and we may not get relief from the Tariff Commission. I have not any too much confidence in that kind of relief; but when I take the hearings of a committee of which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut was a member and

search through the records of those hearings to obtain evidence that warranted the committee in writing certain schedules into this tariff act, and I find that the evidence is not there in open hearings, it would rather lead one to believe that possibly the leaders of the industries came to certain members of the committee and said, "This is what we want"; and they certainly got what they wanted; but they did not present the evidence in the open hearings before that committee.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to finish my remarks, this discussion between the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Connecticut can proceed in their own time.

Mr. McLEAN. I hope the Senator will just let me reply.

Mr. NYE. Will it be brief, Mr. President?

Mr. McLEAN. Very brief.

Mr. NYE. And not invite any further debate at this time?

Mr. McLEAN. Very brief, I assure the Senator.

Mr. NYE. Very well.

Mr. McLEAN. I do remember, and remember distinctly, that when we adjusted the schedule which related to agricultural products we did not make any very definite investigation. We took the word of the Senators who at that time represented the agricultural bloc; and it is my definite recollection that in every single instance we gave to the representative of the agricultural bloc the rate that he requested. I myself had something to do with the rate on cheese, because I was told by a Senator from the Northwest that he thought the rate on cheese ought to be so and so, and it was adjusted to suit him. The rate on butter may have been a trifle low, but it has been increased since by the President.

Why lose faith until you have tried? You would be in a much stronger position here to-day, gentlemen, if you could show that in the case of these rates that you suspect are excessive you had gone to the Tariff Commission and requested a reduction. If you think that anything was done by the Committee on Finance that should not have been done, that anything was done behind closed doors that should have been done with doors open, take your case to that commission. If they turn you down, then come to Congress and give us the reasons for a change.

Mr. McMASTER. Just one moment, Mr. President, and then I shall be through.

In regard to agricultural products, the distinguished Senator says that not much testimony was taken.

Mr. McLEAN. We gave the farmers all they wanted.

Mr. McMASTER. The representatives of every farm organization in America appeared before that committee. Your report upon agricultural commodities is comprehensive as to the tariff schedules that they wanted. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut was a member of the committee. The producers of 14,000,000,000 pounds of milk went before the committee and asked for a schedule of 3½ cents a gallon, and your committee gave them 2½ cents. They asked for a duty of 10 cents a pound on butter, and you gave them 8 cents. They asked as high as 10 cents a dozen on eggs, and you gave them 8 cents. They asked for a higher duty on rice, and you cut that down. They asked for a higher duty on peanuts, and you cut that down. They asked for a duty upon hides, and you gave them a small duty upon hides, but that was knocked out here in the Senate. As a matter of fact, the Finance Committee cut down nearly every schedule that the agriculturists of America asked for. Far different, indeed, was the treatment accorded the industrialists.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

Mr. NYE. I can not yield any further. I promise the Senator that within a very few minutes he can have the floor and take all the time that may be required.

Mr. McLEAN. I simply wish to say that the Senator from South Dakota is entirely mistaken.

Mr. NYE. I have set out this afternoon to express the wish of the agricultural people of the United States to be given an equal balance of favor in so far as favors of Government are concerned, and so far as those figures can be given. I am sorry, and I think it is most unfortunate, that there should be as many people as there are in the frame of mind which holds that everything is just as it ought to be and can not be improved upon, that we are living in a wonderful era of prosperity and surplusage. To sum up the whole matter, I would only say that I hope we can come to face the facts as they really exist to-day, and, in facing those facts, give them the consideration which they merit when we are acting upon the important legislation which is before us.

The entire question is pretty well summarized by the editor of a little paper published out in Pasadena, Calif., known as the American Atlas, in an open letter addressed to the President

of the United States—and it might as well have been addressed to the Congress of the United States—in which he says this—

[From the American Atlas, Pasadena, Calif.]

PASADENA, CALIF.

President CALVIN COOLIDGE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recently there were three holdups, one murder, two automobiles stolen in Pasadena, and I have just received word that an aqueduct has been blown up near here.

Inasmuch as our Nation has marines in China and Nicaragua to protect American lives and property, I ask that a troop of marines be stationed here in Pasadena for the same purpose.

The Standard Oil Co. has several stations and a depot here, which the marines could protect, making them feel entirely at home.

The schools of Los Angeles are forced to feed 3,000 starving children. May I have copies of your speech, in which you said that the farmers had raised too much foodstuffs? I would like to distribute this speech among these children.

If it is not asking too much, I would also like to have copies of Mr. Mellon's speech in which he announced that we were in the midst of a great wave of prosperity. I would like to distribute this speech among the parents of these 3,000 children. If you have any extra copies, please forward for distribution to the 80,000 unemployed of Los Angeles.

Yours for continued prosperity, less food, and more marines,

THE EDITOR.

MR. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the resolution under consideration was introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER], who comes from the very heart of the great agricultural section of this country—at least, from the heart of the grain-growing section. I have abundant reasons for knowing that the people of that section of the country are wedded to the principle of protection to American industries; and I have no doubt at all that the Senator who is the author of the resolution shares fully in the views of his constituents in relation to that particular subject.

I do not think the resolution as originally introduced was at all subject to the construction which seems to have been given to it in some quarters, namely, that it called for anything like a horizontal reduction of all the schedules or rates. It evidenced a desire for a revision of the tariff, and a study again of the schedules as they exist in the present law, with a view to reducing those that could be reduced with safety to industry.

The agriculturists of the country have abundant cause for the restiveness which they have exhibited and the discontent which prevails among them, evidenced by this resolution. Although a kindly Providence has favored the Northwest this year with abundant crops, the industry of agriculture is still carried on under a most decided disadvantage. Figures given me by the Bureau of Markets of the Department of Agriculture only a few days ago show that with respect to commodities generally the average prices have advanced from the standard of 100 between 1909 and 1913 to 151, while the prices of farm products generally have advanced only to 132. That is to say, while farm prices have risen on an average 32 per cent, the prices of commodities generally have gone up 51 per cent. So, Mr. President, the same quantity of agricultural products which in 1909 to 1913 would buy \$100 worth of other goods will now buy but \$86 worth of those goods.

It was really begging the question for the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] the other day to discuss the question of the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar, saying that the farmer's dollar had exactly the same value as any other dollar. Of course, literally, that is true; but the expression very tersely indicates the idea now generally understood, that the farmer is operating under a disadvantage of at least 14 per cent as against other industries in this country—a disadvantage so oppressive as that any industry which labors under it must suffer from the severest depression, if, indeed, it is not headed for bankruptcy. It presents a problem of so serious a nature that it has always been a matter of astonishment to me that those Representatives who come from the industrial section of the country exhibit so much indifference with respect to it.

It is retorted, however, that the farmer is protected by duties upon most, or at least many, of his products. Even the item of wheat is referred to in this connection, and the farmer is told that he has a tariff of 42 per cent upon the production of wheat. The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson], in the course of his remarks on Tuesday, quite frankly admitted that with respect to any of these agricultural prod-

ucts, of which we produce a surplus, which must find a foreign market, the tariff is almost altogether entirely ineffective.

Indeed, Mr. President, that principle is the basis of the so-called McNary-Haugen bill. If the tariff upon agricultural products, and particularly on wheat, were effective, there would be no occasion for the relief which it is sought to secure by that legislation. By consulting the reports upon that measure in both branches of the Congress it will be found that it is there stated that to a large extent the tariff upon agricultural products is ineffective, and that gives occasion for the legislation.

My esteemed friend the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Brookhart], in the course of some remarks a few days ago, told us that the Canadian farmer is now getting for his wheat 25 cents a bushel more than the American farmer receives, or thereabouts, notwithstanding the tariff. I do not find the statement to be supported by the figures given me by the Department of Agriculture, but it is true that the tariff upon wheat is, as shown by a comparison of the prices in Winnipeg and Minneapolis, without any value whatever to the farmer. I find, for instance, that during the months of September, October, and November, during which the very largest proportion of the wheat produced in the Northwest finds the market, the price was practically the same in both of these markets. There has been a little spread in the month of December, but of no very great consequence. For instance, the average price of No. 1 hard dark northern spring in the month of September was \$1.44 in Minneapolis. In Winnipeg the same No. 1 hard dark northern spring was \$1.45. During the month of October the No. 1 hard dark northern spring was \$1.45 in Minneapolis, and in Winnipeg it was \$1.44. During the month of November the average price of No. 1 hard dark northern in Minneapolis was \$1.43, and in Winnipeg it was \$1.45. In the month of December the average price of No. 1 hard dark northern spring in Minneapolis was \$1.48, and in the month of December in Winnipeg the average price was \$1.40.

That was not only the condition during the season just passed, during the year 1927, but the prices were practically the same during the preceding year, 1926; and on the day on which the Senator spoke, the 13th, the spread between Minneapolis and Winnipeg was a matter of 6 cents, the price in Minneapolis being \$1.43 and in Winnipeg \$1.40.

MR. BROOKHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Frazier in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Iowa?

MR. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

MR. BROOKHART. My quotations were taken from the daily quotations in the Chicago Tribune, which showed that on September 8 No. 1 northern in Minneapolis was \$1.33 to \$1.38, and in Winnipeg \$1.52½, a spread of 14½ cents. On November 16 the same grade is reported in the Chicago Tribune as selling for \$1.24 to \$1.30 in Minneapolis, and for \$1.50½ at Winnipeg, making a spread of 20 cents. In the meantime the Canadian Railway Commission, on the 12th of September, had lowered the freight rates on wheat to the seaboard points. So I think when we get it figured out on the actual grades, wheat was a little higher at Winnipeg than at Minneapolis, taking the same grade.

MR. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from Iowa and I will no doubt agree, at least, that so far as the marketing of the great bulk of the wheat raised in the Northwest is concerned, the tariff is utterly ineffective.

MR. BROOKHART. We agree absolutely on that proposition.

MR. WALSH of Montana. So the retort that the farmer is protected by a tariff on his products as well as the manufacturer has very, very little force.

Those who were here when the tariff bill of 1922 was under consideration will recall very well that both Senator Penrose, who had it in charge in the early stages, and Senator McCumber, who took charge of it later on, declared that the conditions at that time were so variable in character, changing with the changing of the hours, that it was next to impossible, if it was not entirely impossible, to arrive at any rate which could be really justified. They said that a rate which would be entirely adequate to-day, by reason of the changing conditions, would be found entirely too high to-morrow, and that a rate which was adequate to-day would be found entirely inadequate to-morrow, by reason of the change in conditions through which we were going at that time.

MR. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator will recall, doubtless, that during the pendency of the bill changes of rates were



brought in by the committee, based upon the fact that changes had taken place in the economic world within a few days which necessitated changes in rates.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Quite so. So that these gentlemen, in the presentation of this bill to the Senate, frankly admitted that with respect to many of these schedules the rates were placed so high as to meet any conditions that might arise, and then they inserted the so-called flexible provisions of the bill, in order that the excesses might be corrected, or, if inadequacy should be shown, that the rates might be raised.

Particularly at that time, it will be recalled, the German mark had fallen in value so that the payments to German laborers in marks had fallen to the very lowest possible limit; and it was represented that because the Germans were able to get labor at so low a figure, due to the depreciation of the mark, American manufacturers were likely to be driven entirely out of business by the competition likely to ensue from Germany; and there was very much force in the argument. But, of course, since that time things have undergone all manner of change, not only in Germany but in all the countries of Europe where the monetary systems have been stabilized, and some of them have gone to the gold standard. It is because of these conditions that there is a demand quite general throughout the country, reflected in the resolution which is now under consideration, for a revision of these schedules. Anyone who will attempt to recall the conditions under which this law came into effect will, I believe, be surprised that five years have gone by—almost six years—without the change which it was expected would be effected in these schedules within a very brief time after the law came into force.

What is the answer that is made to this demand for a revision of these schedules that were adopted under those conditions? It is suggested that somebody wants to destroy the whole protective system; that the American farmers' American market is to be entirely surrendered, as though it were proposed by anybody to wipe out all customs duties entirely, protective or otherwise, and go on an absolute basis of entire free trade. That is a perfect evasion of the question as to whether the time has not come when many of these schedules ought to be revised, in view of the changed conditions which have ensued.

Not a little has been said thus far, Mr. President, about the duties upon aluminum. Having given some little consideration to that particular item, not only when the tariff bill of 1922 was under consideration but since then, I feel that I might be able to shed a little light upon the advisability of an immediate revision at least in that particular schedule.

The duty on crude aluminum ingots or pigs was raised from 2 cents, as it was under the Underwood-Simmons law, to 5 cents, and upon sheets and coils from  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents to 9 cents. Let us see what was the operation of that change in the law.

The Federal Trade Commission having given to this subject a very careful study, tells us as follows. I read now from page 89 of the report of the Federal Trade Commission on the house-furnishing industry, submitted to the Senate in the year 1925:

The efforts of the Aluminum Co. of America, which were not opposed by the consumers of aluminum ingot and sheet, resulted in an increase in the duty on ingots from 2 cents to 5 cents per pound, and on "coils, plates, sheets, bars, rods, circles, disks, blanks, strips, rectangles, and squares, from  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents to 9 cents per pound." The act went into effect September 22, 1922. The Aluminum Co. of America increased its price of ingots on September 26, 1922, from 20 cents to 22 cents per pound, and on November 1, 1922, the price was again increased to 23 cents per pound. Thus, in a little over one month after the tariff went into effect, the entire increase in duties on ingot aluminum was reflected in the price to the consumer. The price of sheet aluminum was also increased on September 26, 1922, and November 22, 1922, aggregating 3 cents per pound against  $5\frac{1}{2}$  cents per pound increase in the tariff duties.

There was an increase of 3 cents per pound upon ingots or pigs.

I wonder if there is any conception among the Members of the Senate as to just exactly what that increase in price of 3 cents per pound on aluminum meant to American consumers? Since that time the consumption of aluminum has increased very largely. Every manufacturer of household utensils, and particularly every manufacturer of automobile bodies, was called upon to pay 3 cents a pound more for his aluminum on account of this duty as here disclosed.

I have caused a computation to be made and I find that since that time that increase has cost the American people, assuming the increase to be 3 cents per pound, not less than \$800,000, and the duty upon sheets and coils unquestionably was at least a

million dollars. All this goes to the Aluminum Co. of America, the only producer of crude aluminum in this country. Every dollar of it goes to that company, a gift to the company.

That company is also engaged, or at least one of its subsidiaries, the Aluminum Manufacturers Co., in the production of household utensils manufactured from aluminum, upon which, as we were told by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER], there is a duty of 11 cents per pound and 55 per cent ad valorem. I have no doubt at all that it realized from that source as much as it did from the other two sources combined. So that this has amounted to a gift to the Aluminum Co. of America, of which Andrew W. Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, is the controlling figure, of not less than \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000. And for what?

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER] has told us that no evidence of any kind was submitted to the committee of either House justifying any increase in the duty on aluminum.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. May I interrupt the Senator to inquire if he does not think that that fact furnishes a very excellent reason why the power to fix import duties should be lodged in a tariff commission, subject to the approval of Congress in each instance? In that event there would be testimony. The commission would have at its disposal a corps of trained experts, to begin with, and it would be a part of its duty to take the fullest testimony with reference to the expediency of any particular tariff duty. Then, after it had fixed the duty, the duty would be subject to the approval or disapproval of Congress. In other words, the duty would be reported to Congress and unless Congress disallowed it within some fixed time it would automatically go into effect.

I am curious to know how the Senator feels about this proposition, because he has had great experience in relation to the tariff and the enactment of tariff laws. It seems to me that it might lead up to an ideal state of affairs. The organization of such a commission would be followed by the fullest opportunities for taking testimony in regard to tariff duties. The public is in no position to know whether a duty is excessive or not. Possibly we can not hope for a tariff system administered by a tariff commission, closely similar in point of organization and otherwise, to the Interstate Commerce Commission. But I will say to the Senator that the special tariff investigating committee which was appointed by this body is about to report, and so far as the trend of the members of the commission, both Democratic and Republican, has become evident, it has, I should say, been in the direction of such a commission.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not like to be diverted from the course of the argument I am making to discuss with the Senator now the question of the advisability of a tariff commission having power to fix rates subject to revision by Congress.

Mr. BRUCE. My interruption was rather untimely, I admit.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That subject is one which has been debated over and over again in the Congress of the United States. Something like 20 years ago the ideas of the Senator from Maryland were elaborately discussed and many eminent statesmen and economists advocated the idea now advanced by the Senator. It never, however, had the approval of the leaders of either political party in either House of Congress. The present Tariff Commission, however, is authorized to go almost as far as the Senator has suggested. That commission is supposed to be equipped with experts. It is supposed to study every schedule in the act. It is supposed to accumulate all possible information with respect to matters. When we had the bill of 1922 under consideration it gave us such information as it could command with respect to practically every item in the bill, and with respect to most of them the Congress of the United States paid no attention whatever to the recommendations of the commission.

Mr. BRUCE. Of course, the Senator is aware of the fact that the commission as at present organized simply reports the results of investigations to the President, and, as I conceive it, the President is the very last person in our entire political organization who should have anything to do with the tariff.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I agree quite fully with the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. Then again I imagine undoubtedly a good deal of this opposition to the Tariff Commission is due to the fact that, of course, there are some selfish considerations by a considerable part of the Republican Party that it should be merely a continuation of the old system of fixing tariff duties, because we all know that one of the effects of the Tariff Commission is

very considerably to increase the capacity of very wealthy Republicans to make handsome contributions to the Republican funds from time to time as such contributions are needed.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I may say to the Senator from Maryland that when the tariff bill of 1913 was under consideration I made a very determined but vain effort to induce my colleagues to put in a provision for the appointment of a tariff commission. I failed, but it was only three years afterwards when the present commission was created. That it has not met the expectations of most of us need not be elaborated.

Mr. BRUCE. I think it is of very little use as organized at present. All the revisions have been upward and none downward, and the commission finds it very difficult, no matter how honorable its motives may be, to resist the personal views of the President in regard to fixing the tariff rates. I think the flexible provisions of the tariff law should be repealed, and I think the President ought to be completely eliminated from any connection at all with the fixing of tariff duties. I am obliged to the Senator for recording that fact to which he has just referred.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I was endeavoring to call the attention of the Senate, when the interruption occurred, to what there was before the committees of the Congress upon which the rate was fixed. Mr. Davis, representing the Aluminum Co. of America, came before the House Committee on Ways and Means and said to them:

We are asking a tariff only to compensate for the difference in the cost of manufacture between Europe and this country, and that on pre-war or normal conditions. It is impossible to say what the actual condition is under these abnormal conditions, but under pre-war conditions we estimate that the difference in the cost of manufacture is about 7 cents per pound, which was the duty that we had under the Payne-Aldrich Act.

That is to say, in the year 1922 the same rate was asked as was given by the act of 1909, the investment in the industry meanwhile not being taken into consideration at all. He frankly stated that they had not any basis upon which the fact could be determined.

But, Mr. President, it will be observed that while a tariff was asked equal to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, no figures whatever were given as to what it cost to produce this article either in this country or abroad; at least no information was given to the Congress upon the subject. We find, however, in a bulletin gotten out by the Tariff Commission that they did have before that body some evidence from the Aluminum Co. of America of the cost of producing their product here. I read from page 41 of the Tariff Information Surveys on the articles in paragraph 143 of the tariff act of 1913, speaking of the cost of the manufacture of aluminum:

Detailed cost figures for 1917 covering the making of aluminum from the mining of the ore to the remelted ingot are in the confidential files of the Tariff Commission. These figures were submitted by the Aluminum Co. of America to the committee on raw materials, Council of National Defense. In the tariff hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, prior to the act of 1913, a brief submitted by Julius Hess & Co., of Chicago, gave the cost of 1 pound of aluminum metal at 12 cents in the United States and 6 cents in Germany at that time.

The current price of aluminum is 27 cents. It has been held at that figure, although it was but 22 cents at the time the present act was passed. It has practically remained at the figure of 27 cents since that time. I can furnish the Senate with some information concerning the cost of producing aluminum.

If Senators will turn to page 4387 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 67, part 4, of the Sixty-ninth Congress, they will find there inserted an article from the Mining Journal of January 30, 1926, written by Robert J. Anderson, of Cleveland, Ohio, bachelor of science, metallurgical engineer, and doctor of science. The article discloses that the writer is thoroughly familiar with this particular subject. He tells us—and I read from page 4387:

Calculations for the production cost of aluminum have been made many times by those competent in the business. Thus Debar gives the cost for German practice as about 16 cents per pound, including interest and investment and amortization of plant. Clacker, of the British Aluminum Co. (Ltd.), has quoted the figure of 12 cents. Collet has given 8.6 cents for Norwegian practice, Nissen has given 12 cents for European practice in general, and Lodin has quoted 11 cents per pound. Calculations by the writer for American practice show 13 + cents, which is amply high.

It costs 13 cents a pound to produce aluminum in this country and the current price of that article is 27 cents. When it was 22 cents per pound and it cost 13 cents a pound to produce

it, Congress then added a duty of 3 cents more per pound, without any justification whatever, as I have attempted to show.

Mr. President, I challenge any Senator upon this floor to stand here and attempt to make a justification of these rates. They are nothing more than a pure gift to the Aluminum Co. of America of anywhere from three to five million dollars a year. Senators will bear in mind also that that company is the sole producer of aluminum in America—a perfectly ironbound, copper-riveted monopoly.

Then, another thing, Mr. President. It is not pretended that there is any other element in the cost of producing these articles making the cost in this country greater than it is abroad except the labor cost. Here are the ingots or pigs upon which there is a duty of 5 cents per pound. Those pigs are rolled into sheets; they are simply passed through a rolling mill and come out in sheets instead of in the shape of pigs or ingots. I undertake to say—and I challenge anybody to demonstrate to the contrary—that it does not cost all together 4 cents per pound to roll the ingots of aluminum into sheets, not to speak about the difference in the cost of doing that work in this country and abroad.

Of course, if there were any mills in this country that were engaged in the production of sheets out of ingots they would be entitled to a compensatory duty equal to 5 cents a pound; and then they would have an additional duty of 4 cents on top of that simply for rolling the ingots into sheets.

Mr. President, how can a thing like that be justified? I should think that gentlemen here who are attached to the principle of protection, who believe that it is a sound policy, who insist that it ought to be preserved, would hasten to remove these excrescences from the tariff law.

However, Mr. President, whatever may be the cost of rolling ingots into sheets, what part of that entire cost must be attributed to the labor that is employed in it? As a general rule, upon manufactures of this kind the entire labor cost rarely exceeds 20 per cent, and the difference between the cost of labor in this country and abroad can be only a small fraction of that 20 per cent.

Mr. President, I said to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] that, notwithstanding the fact that the Tariff Commission had furnished us with all manner of information upon these subjects when we had the tariff bill under consideration, the necessary deductions from the facts they gave us were entirely disregarded in fixing these rates. In the case of most articles the entire labor cost was given and the rate fixed often exceeded the entire labor cost, not to speak about the difference between the cost of production in this country and abroad.

At the time this matter was under consideration the Chicago Tribune, one of the great Republican newspapers of the country, called attention to the injustice and the wrong and the oppression of this particular schedule, and then stated that it was altogether likely that similar injustices could be found in many of the schedules in the bill. Anyone who knows anything about the course of the passage of that act can not doubt that that is the case.

Mr. President, I insist that the revision called for by the pending resolution ought to have taken place years ago; and I think it is occasion for wonder that the Representatives from the sections of the country which have suffered so seriously and been so seriously oppressed by these heavy rates have not long ere this asked for a revision, as is contemplated by the resolution under consideration.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I can neither vote for nor against the pending resolution and thereby express my view as to the situation, which fact seems to necessitate a word from me more in the nature of an explanation of my vote than an attempt to discuss the subject itself.

I voted against the present tariff law at the time of its passage. I voted against it for two reasons. I thought, in the first place, that there were a number of the schedules which could not be defended upon what I conceived to be the proper theory of protective duties. It is my view that when an honest, thorough investigation is made to ascertain the difference between the cost of producing an article in this country and the cost of producing it abroad, the correct theory of a protective tariff is that the duty should express that difference. It seemed to me that a number of the duties in the bill were far in excess of that rule. I quite agree with the statement made by the Senator who has just taken his seat [Mr. WALSH of Montana] that it is quite as much the duty of those who believe in the protective system to guard against those mistakes as it is the duty of those who are entirely opposed to the system.

Naturally, therefore, Mr. President, having voted against the bill because of what I conceived to be errors in it in that



respect, I am sympathetic with the resolution which would urge a revision of the present tariff law, and, in so far as the resolution urges a revision or expresses the desire for a revision, it has my sympathy. I do not want, however, to vote for a resolution which would commit me to what might be called the doctrine of a horizontal downward revision. I am particularly opposed to that, in view of the situation which the agricultural interests occupy under the present tariff law or under any tariff law which might be enacted.

My second objection to the present tariff law was and is because of what is known as the flexible-tariff provisions of the law. If those provisions of the present tariff law are not in contravention to the Constitution of the United States, then I have studied that instrument and our whole theory of government in vain. I think it is a wrong principle. If there was anything about which our fathers were primarily concerned, it was to keep wide apart the sword and the purse and not permit them to be in any sense under the control of the same individual. We have gone a long way, Mr. President, toward giving to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States the power to control the revenues of the Government. It is not a conclusive step, but it is an important step; and, in so far as it is a step at all, it is a vicious one. I feel that the President, the chief executive officer of the Government, regardless of who he may be or what party he may represent, should have no power or authority with reference to fixing tariff duties upon imported articles, save such as is given him in his authority to sign or veto measures passed by the Congress.

If we can give to the President of the United States the power to increase or decrease rates of duty to the extent of 50 per cent, we can give him the power by the same authority to increase or decrease them 100 per cent, and we can place in the hands of the Chief Executive what, in my judgment, is a sufficient control of the revenues of the Nation to make that control effective as to the amount of revenue which shall be collected.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. If the President may change the rates of tariff duty, he may likewise change the rates of taxation on incomes or anything of that kind, may he not?

Mr. BORAH. I should think that the same authority, if it could be found anywhere in the Constitution, which would authorize him to do the one could authorize him to do the other.

It is true, Mr. President, that the Supreme Court of the United States in what is known as the Field case went a long distance in justifying the delegation of what seems to me legislative power; it certainly went further than most members of the profession anticipated it would go before the decision had been rendered; but in that case the court clearly intimated it had gone the full distance. In this matter, however, we have gone an arrow's flight beyond the point which was held constitutional by the Supreme Court in the Field case. It is not only wrong as a constitutional principle, but it is undesirable in practice. I shall not detain the Senate by a discussion of the present Tariff Commission and the present flexible provisions of the tariff act as reflected in the work of the Tariff Commission, but I would deem it of great advantage if the Finance Committee would bring in a bill at this session to permit us to repeal the flexible provisions of the present tariff act. I should like to remove it from the law and once and for all discard the theory which gave it a place in our revenue laws. I know that there are members of that committee who have had in contemplation doing that thing, and I trust they will permit us to go at least that far in remedying what I think is a very bad provision of the law.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question in that connection?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have always felt—this will be a question, not a speech—that the flexible tariff provision as it stands imposed too heavy a burden upon the Executive as a practical matter. Of course, the Senator remembers that the power is delegated subject to strict limits. The President may only make the tariff rate conform to the difference in cost of production here and in the principal competing countries. Would the Senator favor the delegation of that power to some commission in the nature of the Interstate Commerce Commission? That is, would the Senator favor taking the power from the President and conferring it on some semijudicial, semi-legislative body?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should not want to conclude myself at this time by an answer to that question. Before my

experience with the present Tariff Commission I have always been sympathetic with the view which the Senator indicates; and it might be possible that such a law could be framed that I would be willing to experiment with it. I have come to the conclusion, however, after observing the working of the present Tariff Commission, that, slow as the Congress of the United States is, and inefficient as it is in dealing with details of this kind, Congress could meet and pass a tariff law and discharge all its other business covering an entire session and adjourn more speedily than the present Tariff Commission could pass upon one item of that law. Some two years ago there was a petition filed with the present Tariff Commission to revise the tariff on onions, and they have just now got to a notice of hearing.

I perhaps should not discuss the matter further at this time. I want to reserve a conclusive answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. President, I have no desire by any vote of mine here to indicate antagonism to what I conceive to be a wise protective tariff policy. I have no desire to indicate that it is my purpose at any time to take from the manufacturing interests of our country that which they are really entitled to under the rule which I stated a few moments ago. I would not break down the American market as I conceive it would be broken down by reducing the duties below what it costs to produce in this country and abroad. It is extremely important, however, that we shall not abuse that principle; and it seems to me that in view of the conditions under which this tariff law was framed, and in view of some of the facts which we now possess with reference to some of the schedules, a revision of these duties would not only be the just thing to do but the wise thing to do so far as the protective policy would be involved. What I am most concerned about, however, is preserving the market which is built up under the protective policy exclusively for the farm products of the United States in so far as the farmer of the United States is prepared to furnish them. I regard this as the most vital thing in the whole tariff question at the present time.

Heretofore, and until within very recent years, the protective policy has not been of any direct benefit to the American producer. When I say "direct benefit," I mean that the levying of a duty upon products which we were exporting was of no direct benefit to the producer of those articles. Of course, there has always been a contention, and I sympathize with that view, that notwithstanding that fact there has been an indirect benefit to the American farmer by reason of the fact that we were building up, close to home, a permanent, strong market for his products.

I do not regard that as what I term the direct benefit, but as the indirect benefit. No one has stated that indirect benefit better than Mr. Clay many years ago; and I pause long enough to read a paragraph from perhaps his most noted speech upon this subject. When Mr. Clay spoke we were exporters, and very large exporters, of practically all farm or food products. Nevertheless, he said:

Under the operation of the American system the products of our agriculture command a higher price than they would do without it, by the creation of a home market, and by the augmentation of wealth produced by manufacturing industry, which enlarges our powers of consumption both of domestic and foreign articles. The importance of the home market is among the established maxims which are universally recognized by all writers and all men. However, some may differ as to the relative advantages of the foreign and the home market, none deny to the latter great value and high consideration. It is nearer to us; beyond the control of foreign legislation and undisturbed by those vicissitudes to which all international intercourse is more or less exposed. The most stupid are sensible of the benefit of a residence in the vicinity of a large manufactory, or of a market town, of a good road, or of a navigable stream, which connects their farms with some great capital. If the pursuits of all men were perfectly the same, although they would be in possession of the greatest abundance of the particular produce of their industry, they might at the same time be in extreme want of other necessary articles of human subsistence. The uniformity of the general occupation would preclude all exchanges, all commerce. It is only in the diversity of the vocations of the members of a community that the means can be found for those salutary exchanges which conduce to the general prosperity. And the greater that diversity, the more expensive and the more animating is the circle of exchange. Even if foreign markets were freely and widely open to the reception of our agricultural produce, from its bulky nature and the distance of the interior and the dangers of the ocean, large portions of it could never profitably reach the foreign market. But let us quit this field of theory, clear as it is, and look at the practical operations of the system of protection, beginning with the most valuable staple of our agriculture.

That states the view of the protectionist with reference to agricultural interests as it has obtained and as it has been the doctrine of the Republican Party from its organization and of

the Whig Party prior to its organization. The time is now approaching, however—indeed, it is already here—when the American farmer is receiving and is to receive still more direct benefit from the duties which may be levied upon farm products. The great question is to assure him that benefit. His loyalty to the protective system has earned it, and fidelity to his interest will see that he gets what he has earned in helping to build up this policy.

It is true that in the case of wheat and cotton and hogs we are still exporters; and the direct benefit there does not arise, although I am going to discuss the wheat question with reference to that briefly in a moment. With reference, however, to a vast number of products, all of which enter into and make possible the prosperity of the American farmer, we have now reached a time when we are importing a large amount of farm products which the American farmer is perfectly prepared to supply to the American market.

During the last three years on an average we have imported into this country over \$2,500,000,000 worth of food products which the American farmer is perfectly capable of supplying. I have a list of these products which I may ask to have printed; but, in sum total, they constitute a very large portion of the products of the American farm.

We produce in this country, it is estimated, something like 4,000,000,000 pounds of animal, fish, and vegetable fats, and something like 1,600,000,000 pounds of butterfats. Of course this is an exceedingly important item in the farmer's affairs; and that leaves us about 700,000,000 pounds for exports. Notwithstanding that fact, however, for the last three or four years we have been importing something like 300,000,000 pounds of fats—vegetable fats, but taking the place of those which we produce. There is a large class of business interests in the United States who are interested in securing the importation of these articles. The supply comes from the Asiatic countries, and the amount of the supply is incalculable. The extent to which the vegetable fats could be introduced into this country can only be estimated; but it would absolutely destroy, in my opinion, the home market for the home producer.

According to a statement published in *Annals*, a very respectable authority, we exported in 1898 food products to the value of \$589,988,742. In 1923-24, at a time when the American farmer was hunting for markets, and when he was in that distress which has called for legislation, we imported \$150,000,000 worth of farm products in excess of the exports, covering these items to which I shall refer.

Thus, Mr. President, we have reached a time when the most vital concern of the farmer is to preserve the American market for his products. The present tariff act does not do so. I am not undertaking now to assess the blame. The eastern representatives, as I understand, conceded the schedules prepared by those who represented the western area. I am not about to enter upon that dispute. I am only saying that under present conditions, and by reason of the rapid economic changes in the world's affairs, the present bill does not protect the American farmer. It is one of the items—and a very considerable one—in his present distress.

I sat in this Chamber 16 years ago and heard read from the desk a message from a Republican President advocating free trade for farm products and protection to American manufacturing interests. A few days thereafter I witnessed the leadership of the Republican Party turning to the support of the doctrine that we should have imports free which came in competition with the American farmer and protect the products of the manufacturing interests. It is sometimes said duties do not protect the farmer, but the time had arrived when it was thought otherwise.

I pause to read some of the reasons for this betrayal of what had been the doctrine of the party since its organization. Suffice it to say, by way of explanation of what I shall read, that the design and purpose was to reduce the price of farm products. The time had come when the tariff was a protection to the farm products, and, having arrived, the purpose was to open the markets of the United States to importations from all the agricultural regions of the earth, for Canada was only a beginning.

The President in his message said:

Reciprocity with Canada must necessarily be chiefly confined in its effect on the cost of living to food and forest products. The question of the cost of clothing as affected by duty on textiles and their raw materials, so much mooted, is not within the scope of an agreement with Canada.

The only thing included in the agreement with Canada was that which the farmer produced. Our friends in the East, particularly throughout the New England States, were asking for permission to enter the Canadian market and supply their raw

materials and the food with which to feed their employees, and at the same time were asking protection from the Government for their imports. It was the most pronounced, the most startling, and the most cruel surrender of a policy of a party which has ever taken place, to my knowledge, in the history of the United States. It was not only the surrender of a policy but it was the betrayal of a most loyal constituency.

Senator Root, of New York, said:

Mr. President, there is no one here who believes that there is the least possibility that the people of the United States, until another revolution of sentiment has come, will permit the cost of their living to be increased by the imposition of a duty upon ordinary foodstuffs.

I have never thought that the duties which were imposed upon farm products were of any real general benefit to the farmer.

Therefore he had always supported it.

They have been quite indifferent, affecting only several localities here and there, so long as our production ran far ahead of our consumption. But with the increase of our cities as compared with our farming population, and the using up of our waste lands and the fencing in of old cattle ranges and the reduction of the productive power of our lands, we have about come to the point where the continuance of those duties, instead of being a matter of indifference to the people of the country, would result in putting up the cost of food.

What was proposed to be done in that instance by an open agreement is now being effectuated by the present tariff law. At the present time the products are being admitted into the market under a rule which is in violation of the principle of protection, while in this instance they were proposing an open agreement to that effect.

Here is the New England doctrine at that time:

Massachusetts comes far from feeding itself. In consequence of our extremely small percentage of agricultural workers and the excess of population in proportion to available farm land, the State is mainly dependent on outside sources for its food supply. If, then, we are sure to buy from two-thirds to five-sixths of our food from producers at a distance; if by no possibility we can get whatever advantage might arise from relying on our own farmers to come anywhere near feeding us, no obligation prevents us from seeking to buy in the cheapest market available.

Extension of Canadian reciprocity in the matter of manufacture is, in our belief, for the present out of the question.

These will, at least, not be discouraged—

That is, the manufacturers—

if we can make it possible for our people to buy their food in the cheapest market. If Canada chances to profit by supplying our needs to some small extent, so much the better both for Canada and for ourselves. But there is no reason why we should restrict our new purchases to Canada. If Mexico or Argentina or Australasia can help us out, let us turn to them as well.

This doctrine has never died away. Now I read from a statement made only a few days ago by one of the ablest and most highly respected leaders of Massachusetts:

What harm would there be in taking in from Canada the products of the farm, the mines, the forests, and the fisheries? Reciprocity isn't new. It is a policy we have tried in part.

We had a reciprocal trade treaty with Canada from 1854 to 1866 which covered the natural products, and it was abrogated directly after the Civil War for political and not for economic reasons. If that treaty could have been continued, manufacturers of the United States would not now be obliged to put branch factories all over Canada, and we could have played a great part in the development of that country to the north, rich in natural resources, virgin forests, the largest producer of nickel and asbestos, in fact, everything that would help to have built up and strengthened our own industries.

This doctrine was repeated a few nights ago.

Let me pause to say that if the protective policy is not to be regarded, treated, and applied as a great national system, building up our industries and avocations as a whole and furnishing scope for every bent and gift of the genius of man, then it is a subterfuge and a fraud, a special privilege, and an outrage, and should be destroyed.

I am therefore interested in this particular resolution. In so far as it expresses a purpose to secure a parity of rates between manufactured articles and farm products, it expresses a principle which is exceedingly vital at this time. It does more; it declares for a permanent policy with reference to agriculture.

At the present time, as I have stated, we are importing a large amount of food products. If I had my way about it, so long as the agricultural condition in this country continues anything as it is, I would devote the American market exclusively to the products of the American farmer as to those



products which the American farmer is capable of producing. It is true, Mr. President, that we are exporters of wheat—and that is one of the large items—but it should not mislead us into the belief that we are exporters of a large amount of other farm products of which we are now importers. It should not mislead us into the belief that as to a great number of these farm products we would receive a direct benefit from an increase of the tariff duties.

Let us look at wheat for a moment, and take a glance into the future. It is true that we are now exporting something like 250,000,000 bushels of wheat, but that large amount of exportation is brought about by conditions superimposed by the World War. In 1898 we were exporters of some 500,000,000 bushels of wheat. From 1900 to 1914 the exports went down until they amounted to about 100,000,000 bushels a year, one year dropping down below 50,000,000 bushels. It was estimated by people who had made a study of the subject of wheat that at the then rate of trend by 1918, had it not been for the World War, we would have been no longer exporters of wheat.

It must be borne in mind that Canada can at this time produce one-half of the export demand of the world in wheat. It must be borne in mind that Argentina can increase her acreage ten times what it is now. We know that Canada and Argentina can produce wheat cheaper than we can. In the first place, they have no immigration bar. They have their cheap labor. They have their new land. They have their lands yet unoccupied to be occupied in the future. I venture to believe that Canada and Argentina, under proper stimulus, can to-day supply the export demand of the world in wheat. They will not do it to-morrow, or the next day, or next year, but under the stimulus which is to come, in my opinion, they will soon be supplying a sufficient amount of wheat to satisfy that demand.

In addition to that, we have Uruguay, southern Brazil, to a limited extent western Europe, and we have Rumania, Australia, and New Zealand. We have, in addition to that, Mr. President, the fact that our agricultural interests are not the only agricultural interests which are in a distressed condition. I know of but one possible exception to the statement that throughout the entire world all governments are now interested in protecting their agricultural interests, in stimulating the production of agriculture, and we have to meet the future with the understanding that other governments are seeking to protect their agricultural interests and to build them up, as we are seeking to do.

In addition, there is Russia. Prior to the war Russia was exporting some 250,000,000 bushels of wheat. Since the World War she has exported very little—I think not to exceed thirty or forty million bushels of wheat.

Russia is coming back. There seem to be those who think that because we do not recognize Russia, that takes Russia off the face of the earth. Russia is there, occupying one-sixth of the earth's surface, with the greatest natural undeveloped resources in the world, with a people naturally industrious, home loving, and law-abiding. Give the Russian peasant the modern agricultural implements, as he is now buying them, and Russia will not only put her 250,000,000 bushels of wheat in the market but she will add to it, in all probability, a hundred or a hundred and fifty million bushels.

Mr. President, while we are now an exporter of wheat, and that matter is here for our consideration, we must understand that the time is rapidly approaching when the American market will in all probability be asking for wheat on the outside, and if there is anything that the western man ought to contend for, it is that there be embodied into this law as soon as it can be revised, and in all other laws, the fact that the agriculturists must stand upon a parity with the manufacturers of the United States.

One thing more, Mr. President, and I shall not detain the Senate longer. I said that the agricultural interests throughout the world were suffering from depression the same as our agriculture. It will be remembered that last summer the Premier of Great Britain visited Canada. He was frank as to the purpose of his visit. It was for the purpose of strengthening the ties of the British Empire, economically, politically, and, as he said, spiritually. He asked the Canadians to purchase their manufactured goods from Great Britain, and to purchase what agricultural or food products they did not produce themselves in the Tropics, within the British Empire; in other words, to trade within the British Empire, build up within the British Empire, and exclude the outside world as a matter of trade and economics, so far as practicable to do so.

I refer to that not for the purpose of criticism, or finding fault with the British Premier. He was doing what in my opinion any patriot will do with reference to his own country.

I refer to it for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that we must face the future with the understanding that not only are other countries putting up tariff walls throughout the world, but every effort is being made to preserve the markets for themselves, to build them up among themselves, and to build up their industries and their economic strength within themselves rather than in the outside world.

Mr. Garvin, the great editor of the London Observer, states it in a paragraph. He says in his editorial of October 17:

Thinkers of all parties in this country now know that what they need is a clear, economic policy for the Empire. Any method on which we can generally agree must be more useful in practice than any method on which we hopelessly differ. Imperial preference, as now applied on both sides, is of proved value to the mother country and capable of further but limited extension. \* \* \* The empire is an endless treasure house of unlocked riches. There is nothing required for the sustenance and prosperity of man that it does not abundantly possess or could amply produce. \* \* \* Our more recent investment in Anglo-Persian oil is turning out handsomely. The last few days have reminded us that the industry in Malaya, which provides half the rubber output of the world, was founded by a single individual, with the help of Kew Gardens. \* \* \* A well-organized protectionist country will easily beat out of the field an ill-organized, free-imported country.

Many writers and students of ability have discussed this subject, how Europe is building up her economic life and its effect upon this country. I shall quote briefly from only two—Mr. Simonds, the noted correspondent, and Mr. Clark.

The action of the other nations is referred to, Mr. President, as an economic war against the United States. In a sense, that is an accurate statement; but I do not regard it as an economic war in the sense that it is being carried on for the purpose of punishing, or with the spirit of antipathy or a spirit of revenge. I regard it as an economic policy which they have thought to be in their interest—to build up their home industries, to supply those home industries with their own farm products, to live within themselves, and to have in the future contests that economic strength which they did not have in the last contest. It is not for us to criticize or complain. It is only for us to observe and shape our policy in the light of facts.

Mr. Simonds, in a statement under date of November 14, 1926, says:

I venture to say that under all else in the present tendency toward combination between European people lies the very definite idea of the United States just as the passionate hatred of the United States is at the moment the dominating idea in the minds of millions of Europeans of many nationalities. \* \* \* The fact remains that Europe is moving combination to a degree and in a fashion which would have seemed incredible three years ago, and that in my judgment, the driving force is not any new spirit of peace or any moral revolution, but a definite reaction to what it conceives to be the American menace.

Mr. Evans Clark, a student of European economic conditions, says:

The new French tariff, which occupies the attention of Washington and Paris, is the symbol of a new alignment in world affairs. The possibility of a new Europe looms on the horizon; a Europe that is no longer primarily the market for the manufacturers of America, England, and Germany, but a great industrial complex on its own account bidding for its share of the trade of the world; a Europe whose groupings and alliances follow the line of economic rather than diplomatic or military advantage. \* \* \* The economic entente of Germany, France, and Belgium is already an accomplished fact. Enemies 10 years ago, France and Germany have formed a working partnership in industry and trade that is sealed by a dozen different pacts and ties in Belgium with them with a powerful natural unit of production.

Again, in another article in the New York Times, he says:

Europe has come back. Considering the chaos of even five years ago the achievement is notable. \* \* \* Allowing for all reservations, for all doubt and uncertainties, it may be set down as established that Europe is stronger industrially to-day than it has ever been before. \* \* \* Economics have succeeded diplomacy, and politics is Europe's chief public concern. \* \* \* In the first place, the machinery is the most modern and efficiently operated in the world. New woolen and cotton and linen mills, new sugar plants, new iron and steel works, newly equipped mines and heavy machinery plants have sprung up on the ruins of the old. \* \* \* Europe faces the world to-day re-equipped and with a capacity for production far in excess of pre-war days. Now, that she has it, what is she going to do with it? \* \* \* The peace of Versailles may have stilled the guns of Europe, but it opened another conflict—a struggle between the nations for economic advantage such as has never been seen before. The immediate objects of conflict are the markets of the world, and its battle lines are further flung than Flanders' fields.

Whether it is a wise policy or an unwise policy, when we view the world as a whole, philosophers and theorists may discuss. As a practical fact it is here. As a practical policy it obtains throughout the world. I am interested in the tariff, therefore, as a means of building up and maintaining the home market in the United States and then dedicating that home market to the products of the American farmer. If we can give the home market to the American farmer as he is able to supply it and then protect him against exorbitant and unjust exactions in his effort to reach that market, we shall have gone far in solving the great farm problem.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to make only a few observations upon the pending resolution. I am very glad the resolution was modified as it appears before us to-day.

I have been at all times a believer in the protection of American industry. I find that under the Underwood Tariff Act there was very little difference in the percentage of duties paid upon all of the imports as compared with those paid under the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act, the one being a Democratic measure enacted by a Democratic Congress and the other a Republican measure enacted by a Republican Congress. I think it is therefore safe to assume that in general the entire country is on a nonpartisan basis so far as the system of protection is concerned. The controversy seems to revolve about the question of whether tariff protection shall be uniform, whether all industries shall enjoy the protection of the system, or whether there shall be a maladjustment of the schedule in the effectuation of the American system of protection.

I find the difference in percentages of duties paid under the Underwood tariff operating from 1914 to 1919 and the Fordney-McCumber tariff operating from 1921, when the emergency tariff act passed after the war became effective, up to and ending with the fiscal year 1926, to have been about 5 per cent of the duties paid upon all imports being imported under the two systems of tariff protection.

I desire now to submit a few observations upon the economic situation in the United States as it is now, so far as information is available, and as it has been since the passage of the emergency tariff act of 1921 and the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922.

It is generally conceded that in this period of time we have had the greatest production of wealth that the United States has ever experienced. Never before in the history of the country has there been so much wealth produced as there has been since 1921. When we come to ascertain how this wealth has been distributed we get some very interesting information. I call attention to a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] on January 9, last. In the course of his remarks he said:

Unemployment is small as compared with 1921.

He was speaking in defense of the McCumber-Fordney tariff and its operation upon industries and the general welfare of the United States. What do the actual figures of the Government show about employment at the time of which the Senator from Utah was speaking, as compared with the year 1921? We find in a report of the Secretary of Commerce, in a periodical called Survey of Current Business, issued for February, 1927, that from 1920 to 1926 employment in the United States decreased 18 per cent. In other words, when the Senator from Utah said that employment is better now than it was in 1921 he contradicted the figures of the Department of Commerce which last February stated there were 18 per cent less people employed in 1926 than there were in 1920.

The Senator from Utah said the percentage of commercial failures was not as great in 1926 and 1927 as in 1914. I do not know what they were in 1914. When the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate conducted their hearings on the McFadden banking bill in 1926, Mr. Willis, who had been engaged by a group of bankers in the United States and given a large sum of money to be used for the purpose of investigating the banking situation and the commercial situation in the United States, made the statement that since 1920 we had had more business failures and more banks closing, with greater total assets wiped out, than ever before in the history of the United States. That statement was made based upon information gathered by a group of experts whom he had employed and set to work at the request of the group of bankers who wanted to get the information.

The Senator from Utah said that production has increased. That is true. He also said that wages had maintained a high level. What are the actual facts as revealed by the Government's own figures? In the same periodical issued by the Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, for February, 1927, it will be found stated that from 1920 to 1926 the

total average monthly pay roll for the United States decreased 30 per cent. In other words, labor in the aggregate throughout the United States in 1926 was receiving 30 per cent less than it did in 1920. Never before in the history of the country had there been such a great production of wealth. What part did labor get out of it? According to the figures given labor got 30 per cent less than it did in 1920.

What did labor produce? The Bureau of Labor Statistics in its report for 1927 reported that the quantity of manufactured goods per man employed increased 34 per cent in the last seven years. That is to say, the average workingman in the mills and factories of to-day, under a system of mass production, is giving the employer a yearly production 34 per cent greater, turning out one-third more than he did seven years ago. Here we have a situation where the average man, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, working in the mills and factories is producing one-third more than he was producing seven years ago, and yet Secretary Hoover's statistics show that labor in the aggregate has been reduced in its average monthly pay roll 30 per cent from 1920 to 1926.

What share of this prosperity has the farmer received? At a time when the farmer was exporting a greater amount of agricultural products than he had ever done before in the history of the United States, with the exception of one or two years during the war period, the reports of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture showed that from 1920 to 1923, of the 18 major agricultural products, we averaged three times more in exports than we did before the war.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLAINE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Certainly.

Mr. McLEAN. I was deeply interested in the Senator's statement with regard to the average wage paid to employees in the industrial activities of the country. The Senator will bear in mind that we are now discussing a resolution which calls for a reduction of tariff rates. Does he think that a reduction in tariff rates would be of benefit to those employees who in his opinion are now receiving less than they did five or six years ago?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator evidently has not been listening to my remarks, because I am at the present time addressing my remarks to the statement of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] upon the floor of the Senate when he was speaking of the universal prosperity that has been spreading over the country as the result of the operations of the McCumber-Fordney tariff bill.

Mr. McLEAN. But the Senator is addressing himself to the pending resolution, I assume.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. My time is occupied upon the resolution. I shall come to the resolution after I shall have finished with the statement of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. McLEAN. I was wondering whether the figures which the Senator stated indicated to him that a reduction in the tariff rates applying to those industries where wages have been reduced, would enable the employers to pay higher wages?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am calling the attention of the Senate to these figures to show that under the high tariff schedules in industry, which we were told had been enacted for the purpose of helping the American wage earner to get more out of the wealth which he helps to produce, that the Government's own figures show that the total average pay roll of the country had been reduced 30 per cent during its operations.

Mr. McLEAN. I think the Senator understands my question, but if he does not care to answer it that is for him to decide.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As a matter of fact, I did not understand it as a question but understood him to make a statement.

Mr. McLEAN. I put it in the form of a question. Does the Senator think that a reduction of tariff rates on these industries will put the employers in a position where they can deal more liberally with their employees?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. My observation has been to the effect that the tariff has very little to do with wages, apparently, and that view is borne out by the reports of the Department of Commerce, and, of course, the fact is that wages have been reduced.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator is in favor of the adoption of this resolution which calls for a reduction in tariff rates for the purpose of helping some one, and I assume from the debate that preceded his remarks it was to help the farmer.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Before I have taken as much time as the Senator from Connecticut has upon this resolution I hope to make myself clear.



Mr. McLEAN. I hope the Senator will, though he has not done so up to now. I was asking the Senator a question. He has adverted to men employed in the factories, and has stated they are not getting what they ought to receive, in view of the profits that their employers have made.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I did not make any such statement, Mr. President. I object to the Senator from Connecticut assuming to make my speech for me.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator says that the employees are not receiving as much as they formerly did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield further to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do.

Mr. McLEAN. I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Minnesota should correct his statement. I do not want to misrepresent him, and the Senator knows that. Some employees are not receiving as much as they did. Does the Senator from Minnesota think that a cut in the tariff rates will be of any benefit to those employees?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not know. Let us find out.

Mr. McLEAN. I should find out, I think, before I voted for this resolution.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The increase of the rates in the tariff evidently did not increase the wages of the employees. It is evident that that increase in the tariff schedules reduced their wages.

Mr. McLEAN. There is no evidence of that.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have just read from the report of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. McLEAN. That report does not state that any reduction in the wages of employees is due to the tariff.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I did not say the tariff reduced the wages of individual wage earners. I simply stated the figures of the Department of Commerce show that the total average pay roll had been reduced by 30 per cent in six years. If the Senator from Connecticut finds fault with that statement, he can not quarrel with me, but he must go to the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, who gave out that statement last February.

Mr. McLEAN. I am not finding fault with the Senator's statement; I am trying to find out whether he believes that the adoption of this resolution will improve the situation. The resolution calls for a reduction in the tariff.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Has the Senator from Connecticut finished?

Mr. McLEAN. Yes; I have finished.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the Senator has finished, I desire to go on with my remarks.

Mr. McLEAN. Apparently the Senator from Minnesota has also finished so far as his disposition to reply to my question is concerned.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator from Connecticut, I am sure, will conscientiously admit that he is in a cantankerous mood this afternoon. [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I understood the Senator to say that, according to the report from which he read, the sum total of wages paid to employees is less, indicating that there was a lowering of wages.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; that the total average pay roll had been reduced by 30 per cent, according to the report of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. FESS. I understand that 10 per cent fewer men were employed and that they produced 25 per cent more of products. That would be a reduction of the wages, not because there was a lowering but the ratio would be less through the efficiency of labor; that is, less labor, because of its efficiency, has produced more wealth. I think that is the statement of the Commerce Department.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As I read the report—and I have a copy of it here, or a transcript of what the department stated—the average laborer in the factory, as reported last February, is producing 34 per cent more of the finished products than he was producing seven years ago.

Mr. FESS. That is my understanding.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The employees are producing more. That is not only, in my opinion, due to the increased efficiency of labor but to the vastly greater use of new labor-saving machinery.

Mr. FESS. Yes; the Senator from Minnesota is right as to that.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. There can be no quarrel upon that point. There are several factors which enter into this question, but the fact remains that the total pay roll has been reduced. Of that part of wealth that is being produced labor, as such, does not receive such a large percentage as it did in 1920.

Mr. FESS. I am wondering whether we draw the same conclusion. A less number of laborers produce a greater amount of wealth.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Does that mean that the fewer number, although increasing production, are, as individuals, getting less than they previously did?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It means that a fewer number of employees are getting less than a 10 per cent greater number previously got.

Mr. FESS. Would that mean that the individual laborer is receiving less or all the laborers are receiving less in the aggregate?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I can not speak from knowledge.

Mr. FESS. That is the point to me.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator let me give an answer to the Senator's question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In just a moment I will yield. For instance, last year on the iron range of Minnesota we mined and shipped out between one and two million tons of iron ore more than we did in 1921.

Mr. FESS. With the same number of workers?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. No; with 6,000 men less employed.

Mr. FESS. That is the point.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The individual workers who produced that additional ore with machinery did not as individuals receive any higher wage, but I think it will be found that as individuals they received about the same wage. Labor on the range, of course, in the aggregate, as the result of there not being so many men employed, receive a great deal less.

In Detroit last week I was told that in the painting of automobiles, with a new device for spraying paint, one man can paint more automobiles than five or six men used to paint.

Mr. FESS. That is the Duco method.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes. The men engaged in that work used to get 60 or 70 cents an hour, and I understand the one man who now does the work that formerly used to be done by five or six men likewise receives from 60 to 70 cents an hour.

Mr. FESS. I have understood that they spray a car 11 times and do it as expeditiously as painting it once under the old method.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes. I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which shows that in the highly protected woolen mills wages have actually decreased, while the number of hours have increased. I mean by that that the average wage received by the individual worker was less in 1926 than it was in 1920 or 1924. I call this to the attention of Senators, because the defense and excuse, if not the reason, for maintaining the enormously high tariff rates on manufactured wools is for the good of labor; but the records of the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that the average individual earnings of the laborers in the woolen mills was less in 1926 than it was in 1920 or 1924.

Mr. McLEAN. Is it the Senator's view that a reduction of the tariff would help the situation?

Mr. DILL. I think a reduction of the tariff would help to lower the cost of those products to the consumer.

Mr. McLEAN. That is not the question I asked.

Mr. DILL. Oh, well, the Senator asked me a question. Let me answer in my own way.

Mr. McLEAN. I should like to have an answer to the question which I asked.

Mr. DILL. It would not help the excessive dividends and profits of the woolen manufacturer.

Mr. McLEAN. They are not enjoying any such profits.

Mr. DILL. But it would help the farmer who is almost starving to death, because he has to pay such enormous prices for what he has to buy.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator has read figures as to the wages of the employees of the woolen mills and he finds that they have been reduced.

Mr. DILL. Yes; and in the face of the high tariff given the manufacturers.

Mr. McLEAN. Is it the Senator's idea that a reduction of the tariff would enable the employers to pay higher wages?

Mr. DILL. Oh, no; I do not think the tariff has anything to do with the wages paid.

Mr. McLEAN. Then the Senator does not think that a reduction of the tariff on woolen goods would benefit the employees?

Mr. DILL. I do not think it would hurt the employers and I know it would benefit the great mass of the people who use woolen goods.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator does not think it would hurt the employers?

Mr. DILL. No; because they have such enormous profits and dividends now.

Mr. McLEAN. They have not been enjoying profits for some time past.

Mr. DILL. I have not read the latest reports, but in recent years, since the last tariff bill was enacted into law, their profits have been very large.

Mr. McLEAN. I do not know where the Senator got his figures.

Mr. DILL. Perhaps in the last year their profits have not been so large, but my point is that the tariff does not bring the laborer better wages.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, when I finish I will ask the Senator from Connecticut to explain where wages have been increased at all by the high tariff; and when I say that I say it as one who believes in the protective tariff.

Mr. McLEAN. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I say when I finish I shall give the Senator an opportunity, or the Senator will have the opportunity without my giving it to him, to explain how wages have been increased by the high tariff.

Mr. McLEAN. I am very much obliged to the Senator. It can easily be done.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, what do the Government's own figures show has been the part of agriculture during the past six years while we have had this great era of prosperity about which so much has been said? The Department of Agriculture in one of its reports shows that during the six-year period my State has had a loss in income of \$1,000,000,000. In the report of the subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee for February 16 to February 24, 1926, inclusive, a table shows that from 1920 to 1925 3,500 banks in the United States, with total assets of \$1,600,000,000, were closed and 95 per cent of those banks were conducting business in agricultural communities. The Department of Agriculture also shows in reports issued by it that the shrinkage in income to agriculture from 1919—I do not think that, perhaps, it is fair to take 1919, because that was a year when prices were high and there was inflation—but from 1920 to 1926 the report of the Department of Agriculture shows that the income from agricultural pursuits in the United States decreased 42 per cent. So we have from the Government's own figures a showing that during this period of time there was a decrease of income to agriculture of 42 per cent, and that the total average monthly pay roll for labor decreased 30 per cent, or a total of 72 per cent. What do the Government's own figures show has been the share which industry has been receiving during the same period? We have that from the Department of Commerce, also.

On page 126 of the February issue of the Summary of Current Business, Secretary Hoover has summarized the increase in value of industrial shares. Table 102, stock and bonds, shows that the average price in dollars per share for the 25 leading industrials on the New York Stock Exchange in 1922 was \$98.50. In 1926 they averaged \$165.70—a four-year increase of \$67.12 per share, on the average. In other words, the value of industrial stocks increased 70 per cent, as compared to a decline in farm values of 35 per cent and farm income of 42 per cent, in seven years.

Here we have an economic situation—and I prefer to discuss these things from an economic rather than a political point of view—where we have produced more wealth than ever before in the history of the United States during a period of half a dozen years. We have produced more wealth upon the farm, we have produced more wealth in industry, and still the producers on the farm suffered a reduction in income of 42 per cent in the aggregate. The producers in the mills and the factories during the same period of time suffered a loss in the aggregate of 30 per cent in income, and the 25 leading industrial corporations, according to Mr. Hoover, had an increase in value of their shares of 70 per cent—just 2 per cent less than agriculture and labor lost.

I think that is a situation that demands the most earnest attention of every Member of Congress and every American citizen. It is a very astonishing condition. I am not going to say that this is all due to a high protective tariff. I would not make such a rash statement. I do not know to what extent it is affected by the tariff; but I think we ought to find out.

The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], who has at all times, so far as I know anything about his record, been a high protective-tariff defender, said the other day, "We have discovered that the tariff on agricultural products has not been effective."

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] either yesterday or the day before stated to the Senate that he had given the subject very careful consideration and investigation, and had reached the conclusion that the tariff amounted, I think, to about 8 per cent of the difficulties now suffered by the agricultural interests of the country. It may have been 12 per cent; it was either 8 or 12 per cent, I think.

That was the result of his careful investigation. Of course, I could not agree with him even as to the 8 or 12 per cent. We can speculate as much as we please; but it is my impression that if we did not have prosperity in other sections of the country the condition of the farmer would be very much worse than it is now.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course, that is a matter of speculation and opinion, and everyone is entitled to his own opinion about it. I am merely calling the Senator's attention, as shown by the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Department of Agriculture, to what has happened to agriculture, what has happened to labor, and what has been agriculture's share of this prosperity.

Mr. President, I may say that I find that a former distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Hon. Knute Nelson—far more distinguished than the Senator who has the honor of addressing the Senate to-day—was here when the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act was passed. He said, among other things, in speaking of the tariff on agricultural products:

I suppose it is to make a big showing for the farmer, to make him believe that he will get all the excess duty in one form or another, and to make it easy for him to swallow the high duties on manufactured goods.

He also said:

It is evident, it seems to me, that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCumber], in his zeal to put such an immense tariff on agricultural products, higher than we have ever had before, higher than there ever was any necessity for, has done so simply to oil the protection machine for the woolen schedule and some of the other schedules in the bill.

He said:

I am very sorry that the committee have gone to such extremes as they have. I had hoped, Mr. President, that protection would not run mad as it has done.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, but the Senator has reached the conclusion that the rates in the Fordney-McCumber bill were only 5 per cent higher than those in the Underwood bill.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is, in the aggregate.

Mr. McLEAN. In the aggregate.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not mean to say that they were uniformly that throughout the two bills. My predecessor, the Senator from Minnesota, who was here at the time and whom I was quoting, said that they had gone mad. I take it that he meant on certain schedules, and not in the aggregate.

I do not care what kind of a price level you have in this country, whether you have an inflated one under an inflation of the credit structure and under the high protective tariff, or a low one, provided you have it uniform and maintain it at all times. Then every one is on an equal basis. Every one is on the same price level. But when you have a situation where the dollar of agriculture is down here and the dollar of the manufacturer is up there, you have a maladjustment that affects the distribution of wealth; and, as the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Department of Agriculture showed, when wealth is produced as it has been produced here in the past six years the distribution has been absolutely unjust to agriculture and to labor.

I want to refer again to what the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] said the other day when he said, "We have discovered now that the tariff on agricultural products is not effective."

In my opinion, if an investigation under this resolution should show that some of these schedules are entirely too high, they ought to be reduced. If some schedules are too low, they ought to be raised. If any schedule for agricultural products is to be effective—as the Senator from Indiana admitted and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] this afternoon admitted that they are not, now—some way must be found to make these tariff schedules effective for agriculture.



I do not claim that this resolution embodies any complete remedy at all. I never claimed for the McNary-Haugen bill that it carried a complete and adequate remedy for agricultural relief; but it was at least an attempt to make the tariff effective, and I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that while it might not have been as long a stride in the right direction as could be taken I fail to see where the Senator from Connecticut has pointed out a better way to go in finding a solution.

Now, Mr. President, I want to say a few words about something we have heard a great deal about, and that is the so-called sectional point of view.

We of the Northwest have been charged with having not a national point of view but a sectional point of view. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut this afternoon admitted that, so far as he was concerned—and I want to compliment him for his honesty in that—environment affected the point of view. I think it applies to all men. That is perfectly natural. They are all human. But we of the West in the last few years have been accused of being unduly sectional in our point of view, and the general impression seems to have been carried out in propaganda that that is peculiar to our section of the country.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, the Senator will realize that, inasmuch as we have different points of view—and I think we have had expressed here in the Chamber at least three distinct schools of thought on the tariff question since this subject was brought up—we can not all be right; and it is very important that we should avoid adopting a wrong course in this matter. We can not all be right; we may all be wrong; but it seems to me very important that before we disturb the complex and colossal industries of this country by a revision of the tariff we ought to avoid the wrong course if possible.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Before we have a definite point of view, let us get some facts. That is what I am trying to give to the Senator.

Mr. McLEAN. I have not received any yet. I am frank to say that I have listened here for three days, and up to date I have not heard a single fact stated in this body that would warrant the adoption of the resolution under consideration.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator some time ago asked some Senator here to have faith in his Government. I am simply giving him some figures from his Government.

Mr. McLEAN. If the Senator will pardon me, I will call his attention to one fact that was brought to the attention of the Senate yesterday by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND].

His wife bought an aluminum utensil of some kind. She wanted to preserve some fruit. I think he called it a pot. She paid \$4.55 for it. The Senator from New York, as a profound student of economics, told the Senate what tax she had to pay on that utensil. Eleven cents a pound on the raw material made 33 cents. He took a dollar off from the price she paid, \$4.55, which resulted in \$3.55. That, in his opinion, carried an ad valorem tariff of 55 per cent. That made a tax of \$1.95. He added the 33 cents to the \$1.95, and made a tax of \$2.28 as the tax his wife had to pay on that utensil.

Mr. JOHNSON. How much was that, please?

Mr. McLEAN. Two dollars and twenty-eight cents.

Mr. President, it does seem to me that any man who undertakes to discuss the tariff question in this Chamber ought to be sufficiently considerate of his own reputation to avoid such a statement.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. To whom is the Senator referring?

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. I am sorry he is not in the Chamber.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If it is all the same, I will ask that the Senator be given an opportunity to answer the Senator from New York in his own time.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator rather challenged my attempt to inform the Senate as to what fact had been introduced in support of the friends of this resolution.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield a moment, I wish to say that if the distinguished Senator from Connecticut had remained in the Chamber when he knew that certain schedules were being discussed just a few moments ago, he would have had an ample opportunity to ask questions and to answer questions. Now, I should like to hear the distinguished Senator from Connecticut explain the aluminum schedules and defend those aluminum schedules.

Mr. McLEAN. I will say to the Senator that I have to consume agricultural products; I could not occupy a seat in this Chamber if I did not. I retired from the Chamber a few moments to partake of some pea soup. I do not know what the tariff is on peas; but that was the excuse for my absence from the Chamber. I have tried to be here all the time this matter has been under discussion.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Whatever the tariff is, the Senator from Indiana will inform the Senator that it has not any effect on agricultural products; so it does not make any difference what the tariff on pea soup is.

Mr. McLEAN. But I thought the Senator wanted the tariff raised on agricultural products.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I said we want it made effective.

Mr. McLEAN. I do not know whether it would be effective to raise the tariff on peas or not. Whatever the Senator wants to do, I am with him so far as agricultural products are concerned.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I thank the Senator for that.

Mr. McLEAN. To return to aluminum, of course, every Member of this body who knows anything about the subject understands that the ad valorem tariff would be imposed upon the foreign value of this utensil about which the Senator from New York spoke, which, as near as I can ascertain, would be less than \$1 on the imported similar article.

So, if you take 55 per cent of \$1, you will get the ad valorem duty on this article. The Senator from New York was only about 66 2/3 per cent wrong. That is doing pretty well for anybody on the other side of the Chamber who undertakes to discuss the tariff question.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, wisdom and honesty both dwell on the Republican side.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said that he is ready to raise the tariff rates upon agricultural products.

Mr. McLEAN. Yes.

Mr. HOWELL. How can we do it unless we get at tariff legislation?

Mr. McLEAN. We can not do it by lowering the rates on other articles.

Mr. HOWELL. Yes; but this resolution proposes to provide more nearly a parity for agricultural products. A parity can be secured by lowering the rates on nonagricultural products, or raising the rates on agricultural products, in the cases where it would be effective.

Mr. McLEAN. Yes.

Mr. HOWELL. How are we going to do this unless we get at the matter and act as this pending resolution suggests?

Mr. McLEAN. Go right to the Tariff Commission and ask for a 50 per cent raise. You have had it on two articles already. Go down and ask for a raise on the other product, the tariff on which you want increased. Do not come here and complain that you can not do anything until you try the remedy that is already in your hands.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, blackstrap molasses, upon which there is a tariff of one-sixth of a cent a gallon, has put out of annual consumption in the production of alcohol about 50,000,000 bushels of corn in this country. Suppose you raise the tariff one-half of one-sixth of a cent. Would that aid in bringing about parity?

Mr. McLEAN. I do not know, but we tried to raise it when we revised the law in 1922, and the agricultural bloc insisted that they were using blackstrap molasses to put into cattle feed, and they would not stand for it. That is the reason why we did not give them an adequate rate on blackstrap molasses.

Mr. HOWELL. Did the Finance Committee investigate the uses of this molasses?

Mr. McLEAN. No. As to agricultural products we largely took the say-so of the gentlemen who represented the agricultural bloc, I will admit, and gave them all they asked for.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, it is well recognized that blackstrap molasses, which was imported into this country last year to the extent of nearly 300,000,000 gallons, is used by distillers for the production of alcohol, and the distillers were interested in this rate and secured the low-tariff rate of one-sixth of 1 cent a gallon on this product.

It is a further fact that it takes 5.6 gallons of blackstrap molasses to equal one bushel of corn in the production of alcohol. In other words, on that basis there was less than one cent protection on a bushel of corn, and it put out of use 50,000,000 bushels annually in this country for the production of alcohol. It is true we produced about 2,700,000,000 bushels of corn last year, and only about 10 per cent of that goes into the market and is dealt in as cash corn, or about 270,000,000 bushels. But 50,000,000 bushels of corn taken out of that demand is of tremendous moment, and undoubtedly affected the price of corn in this country. If you will look at the price index number of corn you will find that for most of the time during the last six and a half years corn has brought about the same price as in 1913. It is one of the aims of the pending resolution to nonagricultural products have averaged 64 per cent higher than in 1913. It is one of the aims of the pending resolution to correct such tariff injustices to agriculture as this.

Mr. McLEAN. I have no controversy with any Senator who is advocating an increase in the tariff rates.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If I have the floor, I shall ask the Chair's protection that I may have a few minutes in order that I may conclude my remarks. I am very thankful for the information that has been furnished by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Connecticut.

I want to return to the subject on which I started to make some observations a few minutes ago—that is, the charge that all in the Northwest are afflicted with what is looked upon as an undesirable complex, a local or sectional political point of view, because we have been charged with that, and I want to present some evidence to show that that disease, if it be a disease, is not peculiar to the Northwest.

I have here a manuscript sent out by an organization that calls itself the New England Council, which sent a questionnaire to the Members of Congress in the House and Senate from New England asking them what they could look for from Congress for New England this year. I have here the answer of the New England bloc to the New England Council. I find that one Member of Congress said, in answer to the questionnaire:

I would say that the one thing in Congress to which New England should give special attention is the matter of so-called farm relief. Practically all the proposals seriously urged by the western farm organizations mean a higher price of food in the industrial communities of New England.

He was speaking, of course, of the McNary-Haugen bill in particular. He was opposed to it, because, he said, it would raise the price of food in the industrial sections.

Mr. McLEAN. Did I understand the Senator to say that the author of that article was in favor of the McNary-Haugen bill?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. No; opposed to it.

Mr. McLEAN. As usual, coming from New England, he was a very sensible man.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. He was looking out for New England; and when we try to do something for the Northwest we are accused of lacking in national point of view and being local-minded. I am simply bringing this to the attention of the Senate to show that if that is an undesirable complex it is not peculiar to the Northwest.

Here is the reply of another member of the New England bloc to the New England Council. He says:

I think New England is interested in maintaining adequate customs duties and in the elimination of the estate tax.

I found that one member of the New England bloc expressed great concern about very many things. I quote from the reply of one. He said:

There will be countless items in the appropriation bills that are important for particular New England communities, such as those having to do with river and harbor improvements, public buildings, navy yards, etc., but I think that you can count upon the representatives of the communities concerned to look after them and to enlist help from home should it prove necessary.

Nearly every one starts out with the statement that New England must be wide awake and look after its own interests. One man stated that it was very important that they should organize and cooperate. He said:

With a little organized cooperation on the part of the various industries whose products are on the free list and of the commercial organizations of the regions affected, I believe that the Ways and Means Committee could be induced to take up this question—

Of raising tariff schedules.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator has used several times the expression "the New England bloc."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the Senator explain what he means by that? That is a new idea to me. I had never heard that there was one. In fact, I have several times wished that there was one. The trouble with most people from New England is that they are all individuals and can not be forced into the confines of a bloc. Will the Senator be so good as to explain?

Mr. McMASTER. I will suggest to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, if he wants to ascertain something about the New England bloc, that he examine practically every roll call in the Senate, it would not make any difference whether on the election of a page or on the adoption of a tariff system, an important thing or an insignificant thing, and he will find that

all New England Senators are always voting alike, with very rare exceptions.

Mr. BINGHAM. I wish that were true, Mr. President.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut will agree with me when I say that it is not necessary for the Senator to ask me about anything concerning New England, the part of the country that has been dedicated to the bean and the cod—

Where the Lowells speak only to Cabots,  
And the Cabots speak only to God.

Here is the reply of another distinguished Member of Congress from New England, writing to the New England Council, which seems to be the central body. He said:

A hostile feeling toward New England is more or less prevalent in Congress. For the past 50 years New England has played a most important part and secured many advantages.

I want to say that I admit that New England has played an important part, and in most respects every American is proud of New England. When we come to discuss the economic situation affecting the tariff, the condition of agriculture, and the distribution of wealth as reflected in the reports of the Government, in some things we have to differ from New England and on this occasion I am attempting to show that while we have been accused of trying to do a little something for our own people, and that to some seems to be an undesirable point of view, I am trying to show that New England has been trying to follow that course for a long time and they admit it.

He said:

I do not intend to introduce politics into your deliberations.

Of course not. They only want to see what they can get out of Congress this year, but they do not like to bring politics into their deliberations.

But merely state the fact that it is of paramount importance that we should have in the White House and in other offices men of ability to defend New England's interests and the power to secure and retain legislation of a helpful nature.

I do not find any fault with that. New England wants to look out for itself, but when New England is feeding her industrial population at our boarding house and refuses to pay the cost of production, I think we have a right to complain. The only thing we ask them to do is to pay us for what they eat. Here we find a distinguished Member of the New England bloc in Congress writing to the New England Council and saying that he is opposed to farm legislation that would increase the cost of food to the industrial sections of New England. I have been in communities where if a man did not pay his board bill they called him various names.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the Senator explain before he gets through why he objects to the action taken by the New England Council in asking the Representatives from the New England States what they think of important measures before the Congress affecting that section of the country, and their frank answers? Why does he object to that?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I am not objecting at all. I am simply stating it as a fact. I said I did not blame New England. I am only pointing out that they are doing and have been doing for a long time what we have been accused of doing, but when we tried to do it in our humble way we were accused of lacking patriotism, lacking a national viewpoint, being provincial. We are simply beginning to follow in the footsteps of New England, which have made New England so prosperous at the expense of the country. We want some of the wealth we have produced. We want to be paid for the food we send to you to feed your people. All we ask is to be paid the cost of production, to be put on an economic level with the people of New England. Is there anything wrong about that?

Mr. BINGHAM. No, Mr. President; only the Senator's remark that that is something which has been going on in New England for a long time and that he had learned it from New England, does not seem to me to be borne out by the fact that the recent meeting of the New England Council from which he is quoting is quite a new thing, and that New England is apparently acting in self-defense and has been driven into that position by the fact that she is not so prosperous as the Senator thinks she is.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If this is a new organization, I take it that it has been formed recently, because they have never been in danger yet of paying their board bill. There is a feeling now that the agricultural sections of the country are going to



collect and I assume that if, as the Senator said, this is an organization of self-defense, he means it is an organization to protect them against this new demand that they shall pay for the cost of production of the food which they eat.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh no; that was not the object of the origin of that organization. The object of the origin was the fact that they found there was unemployment and they were being called upon to meet competition, that the mills were being closed because tariff rates were not high enough to afford the protection against the rejuvenation in Germany, that many mills manufacturing woolen goods were being put out of business by causes over which no one has any control, namely, the decrees of Dame Fashion that people should wear silks instead of woollens. We have had our troubles and we are trying to work them out in our own way. But the Senator's intimation that the origin of this get-together project in New England was aimed at his part of the country I think is not borne out by the facts.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If my remarks carried any such insinuation I am perfectly willing to assure the Senator that they were made more facetiously than seriously.

Now just a word in conclusion. I wanted to get some of these suggestions before the Senate to direct its attention, if I could, to the economic situation which we have here now and the unequal distribution of wealth in the last six years at a time when we have produced more wealth in the United States than ever before in the history of the country. How far the tariff affects this unequal distribution of wealth I think would be well for Congress to find out. To what extent the fluctuation and inflation of the currency and the credit situation affects it, I think the Congress could well spend some time to find out. There are so many factors that enter into the situation that if we can get an investigation into the tariff schedule, and the various other factors which affect the situation, such as freight rates, we can have some facts upon which to base a remedy. As I said, I do not claim that a complete remedy is in the pending resolution, neither do I believe a complete remedy was in the McNary-Haugen bill. The causes are many and come from various sources. The remedy must come in various measures that Congress can devise. This, I think, is a step in the right direction, so I shall vote for the pending resolution.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. WILLIS. I ask unanimous consent out of order to submit a unanimous report from the Committee on Commerce for the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLAINE in the chair). The report will be received.

Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 789) to amend the merchant marine act, 1920, approved June 5, 1920, by insuring the exemption from income taxes during the 10-year period there provided of profits on the sale of certain vessels when the proceeds of such sales are invested in new American vessels approved by the Shipping Board, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 74) thereon.

#### FLOOD CONTROL FOR THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 90, agreed to January 4, 1928, the first report of the Mississippi River Commission, submitted under date of September 28, 1927, relative to flood control of the lower Mississippi River, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from Hamilton & Hamilton, attorneys, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1927, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of papers and documents on the files of the Treasury Department which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER appointed Mr. Smoot and Mr. SIMMONS members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### COMPETITION AND PROFITS IN BREAD AND FLOUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 163, agreed to February 16, 1924, a report of the commission on "competition and profits in bread and flour," which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the report of the Federal Trade Commission just laid before the Senate is of very special importance. It is the concluding report upon an investigation ordered by the Senate upon a resolution introduced by former Senator La Follette, of the State of Wisconsin, directing that commission to inquire into an alleged combine or merger of the baking companies in the country and the effect of the combines and mergers upon the price of bread. Two prior reports have been handed down, both of which have been published. I am advised that the Federal Trade Commission has no funds with which to publish the report. I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the report as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator let that request go over until to-morrow? Another Senator asked me to state that he is interested in the matter and that he would like to be here when the request was preferred.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

- H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of William R. Connolly;
- H. R. 2523. An act for the relief of Harvey Dunkin;
- H. R. 2524. An act for the relief of Mary M. Jones;
- H. R. 2809. An act for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Thomas;
- H. R. 3216. An act for the relief of Margaret T. Head, administratrix;
- H. R. 3394. An act for the relief of W. P. Thompson;
- H. R. 3458. An act for the relief of Charles Beretta, Isidore J. Proulx, and John J. West;
- H. R. 3673. An act for the relief of Maj. F. Ellis Reed;
- H. R. 3926. An act for the relief of Joseph Jameson;
- H. R. 4203. An act for the relief of A. S. Guffey;
- H. R. 4777. An act to compensate Robert F. Yeaman for the loss of certain carpenter tools which was incurred by reason of a fire in the Government area at Old Hickory Ordnance Depot;
- H. R. 4926. An act for the relief of the Pocahontas Fuel Co. (Inc.);
- H. R. 4927. An act for the relief of Francis Sweeney;
- H. R. 5297. An act for the relief of Christine Brenzinger;
- H. R. 5300. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Francke and Blanche F. Shelley, sole legal heirs of Ralph K. Warrington;
- H. R. 5336. An act for the relief of John J. Corcoran;
- H. R. 5338. An act for the relief of Roland M. Baker;
- H. R. 5894. An act for the relief of the State Bank & Trust Co. of Fayetteville, Tenn.;
- H. R. 5923. An act for the relief of the Sanitarium Co., of Portland, Oreg.;
- H. R. 6116. An act for the relief of R. P. Biddle;
- H. R. 6619. An act for the relief of the estate of William Bardel;
- H. R. 7110. An act for the relief of Frances L. Dickinson;
- H. R. 8092. An act for the relief of Randolph Sias;
- H. R. 8093. An act for the relief of John Rooks; and
- H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for the relief of special disbursing agents of the Alaska Railroad; to the Committee on Claims.
- H. R. 519. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Ritcherdsen;
- H. R. 802. An act to correct the military record of Curtis P. Wise;
- H. R. 871. An act for the relief of William Earhart;
- H. R. 971. An act for the relief of James K. P. Welch;
- H. R. 972. An act for the relief of James C. Simmons, alias James C. Whitlock;
- H. R. 1072. An act for the relief of George Adams;
- H. R. 1073. An act for the relief of Richard Brannan;
- H. R. 1530. An act to amend the military record of William F. Wheeler;
- H. R. 1533. An act for the relief of Theodore Herbert;
- H. R. 1534. An act to correct the military record of John Dewitt Marvin;
- H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of John J. Waters;
- H. R. 1590. An act to correct the records of the War Department to show that Guy Carlton Baker and Calton C. Baker or Carlton C. Baker is one and the same person;
- H. R. 1931. An act for the relief of Daniel Mangan;
- H. R. 1970. An act for the relief of Dennis W. Scott;

- H. R. 2272. An act for the relief of William Morin;  
 H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Lucius Bell;  
 H. R. 2294. An act for the relief of George H. Gilbert;  
 H. R. 2296. An act to amend the military record of Robert Zink;  
 H. R. 2422. An act to correct the military record of Jordan Kidwell;  
 H. R. 2472. An act for the relief of Emile Genireux;  
 H. R. 2482. An act for the relief of John Jakes;  
 H. R. 2526. An act for the relief of William Perkins;  
 H. R. 2528. An act for the relief of J. W. La Bare;  
 H. R. 2649. An act authorizing the President to reappoint John P. Pence, formerly an officer in the Signal Corps, United States Army, an officer in the Signal Corps, United States Army;  
 H. R. 2808. An act for the relief of Ella G. Richter, daughter of Henry W. Richter;  
 H. R. 3041. An act for the relief of Alfred St. Dennis;  
 H. R. 3049. An act for the relief of Alexander Ashbaugh;  
 H. R. 3145. An act for the relief of Willis B. Cross;  
 H. R. 3166. An act for the relief of Bert H. Libbey, alias Burt H. Libbey;  
 H. R. 3192. An act for the relief of John Costigan;  
 H. R. 3241. An act for the relief of Seymour Buckley;  
 H. R. 3315. An act for the relief of Charles A. Black, alias Angus Black;  
 H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Estle David;  
 H. R. 3400. An act to correct the military record of Andrew B. Ritter;  
 H. R. 3440. An act for the relief of Alvin H. Tinker;  
 H. R. 3466. An act for the relief of George A. Winslow;  
 H. R. 3467. An act for the relief of Giles Gordon;  
 H. R. 3510. An act to authorize the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Capt. George E. Kraul a captain of Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920;  
 H. R. 3723. An act for the relief of John M. Andrews;  
 H. R. 3737. An act for the relief of John T. O'Neill;  
 H. R. 3969. An act for the relief of James E. Westcott;  
 H. R. 3993. An act for the relief of Adam B. Ackerman, alias Adam B. Aunkerman;  
 H. R. 4013. An act for the relief of Charles R. Stevens;  
 H. R. 4027. An act for the relief of the widow of Warren V. Howard;  
 H. R. 4079. An act for the relief of William A. Hynes;  
 H. R. 4080. An act for the relief of William Smith;  
 H. R. 4104. An act to correct the military record of James William Cole;  
 H. R. 4168. An act for the relief of John Strevy, deceased;  
 H. R. 4280. An act to correct the military record of John W. Cleavenger, deceased;  
 H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of Fred R. Nugent;  
 H. R. 4652. An act for the relief of Charlie R. Pate;  
 H. R. 4654. An act for the relief of Kennedy F. Foster;  
 H. R. 4655. An act for the relief of David E. Goodwin;  
 H. R. 4660. An act to correct the military record of Charles E. Lowe;  
 H. R. 4661. An act to correct the military record of William Mullins;  
 H. R. 4702. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Benjamin S. McHenry;  
 H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Calvin H. Burkhead;  
 H. R. 4902. An act to correct the military record of Charles Robertson;  
 H. R. 5065. An act for the relief of James M. Winston;  
 H. R. 5224. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Gardner;  
 H. R. 5228. An act for the relief of Finas M. Williams;  
 H. R. 5230. An act to correct the military record of Pleasant R. W. Harris;  
 H. R. 5231. An act to correct the military record of James Shook;  
 H. R. 5232. An act to correct the military record of Owen J. Owen;  
 H. R. 5255. An act for the relief of Jacob F. Webb;  
 H. R. 5380. An act to correct the military record of G. W. Gilkison;  
 H. R. 5381. An act to correct the military record of Thomas Spurrier;  
 H. R. 5383. An act to correct the military record of John W. Siple;  
 H. R. 5424. An act for the relief of Anthony Schwartzberger;  
 H. R. 5994. An act for the relief of George C. Hussey;  
 H. R. 6005. An act for the relief of Edward J. Boyle;  
 H. R. 6006. An act for the relief of Patrick J. Langan;  
 H. R. 6007. An act for the relief of John Magill;  
 H. R. 6162. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Ross;  
 H. R. 6180. An act for the relief of William H. Armstrong;  
 H. R. 6185. An act for the relief of Thomas Jefferson Shropshire;  
 H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of Henry Shull;  
 H. R. 6364. An act for the relief of Edward Tigh;  
 H. R. 6389. An act for the relief of Samuel Pelfrey;  
 H. R. 6431. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Easterly;  
 H. R. 6432. An act for the relief of James E. Moyer;  
 H. R. 6438. An act for the relief of David Parrett;  
 H. R. 6442. An act for the relief of Ralph H. Lasher, whose name appears in the Army records as Ralph C. Lasher;  
 H. R. 6579. An act for the relief of James W. Kingon;  
 H. R. 6839. An act to remove the charge of desertion against Israel Brown and to grant him an honorable discharge;  
 H. R. 6917. An act to correct the military record of Sylvester De Forest;  
 H. R. 7227. An act for the relief of William H. Dotson;  
 H. R. 7228. An act for the relief of Frederick Leininger;  
 H. R. 7229. An act for the relief of Henry Simons;  
 H. R. 7553. An act for the relief of James Neal;  
 H. R. 7779. An act for the relief of William H. Wagoner;  
 H. R. 7992. An act for the relief of Sally Mattie Macready, widow of Edward Daniel Macready;  
 H. R. 8190. An act for the relief of John G. Cassidy;  
 H. R. 8370. An act for the relief of Jeremiah F. Mahoney;  
 H. R. 8509. An act for the relief of Albert O. Tucker;  
 H. R. 8574. An act for the relief of Thomas Murphy;  
 H. R. 8589. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Nicholas;  
 H. R. 8590. An act for the relief of Nicholas Jones;  
 H. R. 8599. An act for the relief of George D. Vedder;  
 H. R. 8627. An act for the relief of John Clark;  
 H. R. 8628. An act for the relief of Amos Dahuff;  
 H. R. 8643. An act for the relief of William Taylor Coburn;  
 H. R. 8673. An act for the relief of Edward F. Weiskopf;  
 H. R. 8674. An act for the relief of Lester Cooley;  
 H. R. 8772. An act granting an annuity to Dr. Robert P. Cooke;  
 H. R. 8775. An act for the relief of George P. Bailey;  
 H. R. 8778. An act for the relief of William W. Woodruff;  
 H. R. 8788. An act to correct the military record of Willard Thompson, deceased;  
 H. R. 8796. An act for the relief of Martin L. Duffy;  
 H. R. 8797. An act for the relief of Clayton H. Adams;  
 H. R. 8798. An act for the relief of William Lentz;  
 H. R. 8804. An act for the relief of George W. McNeil;  
 H. R. 8805. An act for the relief of Martha D. McCune; and  
 H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution for the appointment of Paul E. Divine, of Tennessee, as member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
- NATIONAL WOMAN'S DEMOCRATIC LAW ENFORCEMENT LEAGUE
- Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mrs. Jesse W. Nicholson, of Maryland, at the first convention of the National Woman's Democratic Law Enforcement League. It is not very long.
- There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:
- ADDRESS OF MRS. JESSE W. NICHOLSON
- My friends and fellow citizens, it is a pleasure to welcome you here to-day at what will be an epoch-making meeting of earnest Democrats who have the best interests of the Democratic Party at heart.
- You have imposed upon the president and officers of this organization certain responsibilities when you unanimously elected us last May and we are here to render an accounting of our stewardship.
- Seven years have passed since women were enfranchised after a struggle of more than half a century. How often is the question asked, "What effect, if any, has the woman's vote had upon politics?" a question not so easy to answer as at first might be supposed, for many have not taken into consideration that we had to begin at the very bottom and work our way up; yet we are under indictment by the best known political writers over the country, who have said:
- "The women have not changed any political situation or altered the political complexion of any locality. Not a boss has been unseated. Not a convention has broken away from the familiar towing ropes. Nothing has been changed except that the number of docile ballot droppers has been approximately doubled."
- As a matter of fact, we have not voted as men expected us to vote, because we would not vote for what they offered us to vote for.
- This is our opportunity now. We must show the good people of the Nation that the Democratic women of the country propose to emphasize their independence and influence by prevailing upon the leaders of our party to select a "dry" for President and Vice President.
- There are certain types of women, mostly office seekers that are blindly following the politicians, willing to do their bidding, who are



being used as tools to undermine this and any other organization of women who have the courage to come out and stand for something that will protect their homes and their children.

The National Woman's Democratic Law Enforcement League is to be congratulated upon having as our officers and followers strong and capable women, women who, as mothers and wives, know how to stand for a cause which they believe will protect the great race they have created; women who have put everything on the altar of faith, believing in justice, and who have put their country above personal gain; women who have put everything in with no thought of taking anything out. With such women in our organization we can not fail to accomplish the purpose for which it came into existence.

The purpose of this organization is to unite the efforts of women Democrats throughout the Nation who believe in the enforcement of all laws, especially the upholding of the Federal Constitution, to the end that more effective support can be given to those candidates, both for the nomination and the election, who will best advance these principles.

Our organizers and officers have gone before the country to organize leagues upon the following platform:

"That the Constitution of the United States and every article and clause in it is a part of the law of every State in the Union and is the paramount law; that any attempt to revise or modify the same in any manner than that provided in the Constitution for so doing is extra-constitutional and revolutionary; and that the letter and the spirit of our organic laws are binding on and must be observed by the officers of each State in the Union who have taken the oath to support the Constitution of the United States.

"While we declare our firm allegiance to the preservation of every right of individual liberty under the law, we declare that public peace and public order are absolute and essential conditions of free government, and we, therefore, will oppose with our utmost power the forces of disorder and lawlessness, from whatever source they may emanate.

"The supremacy of the Constitution and the laws made in pursuance thereof are the best and wisest guaranties of the rights, liberty, and happiness of all the people, and all movements seeking by deception, political manipulations, threats, or organized popular clamor to overthrow or supplant these guaranties are attempts to destroy the American system of representative government organized and established by the Constitution."

We have been asked many times if we would put forth any candidates; to all such inquiries we have answered, Not yet; we are quite willing that those in authority who have been elected or appointed to official positions within the Democratic Party should not be handicapped and hampered in the selection of a President and Vice President, but we feel we would not be doing our duty as citizens if we sat still, without letting these officials know in no uncertain terms the kind of candidates we want and the kind we will vote for, and if after making our wants known to them far in advance and they do not heed our advice or admonition, we have another course we expect to pursue.

There are certain disqualified wet candidates seeking the nomination for President on the Democratic ticket, and there is a concerted effort by the Republican wet press to back these candidates to the limit, and it has been alleged that Republicans have already spent over \$4,000,000 to further the interests and help the nomination of one of the wet Democratic candidates, knowing how easily they could defeat this candidate. And you will recall only recently of what purported to be spontaneous meetings here and there for this particular candidate, with the press giving much publicity, and some wet Democrats have joined in the chorus.

We dry Democrats must speak now, before it is too late. It is interesting how some of these wet candidates are trying to befuddle the minds of the women and the public by certain carefully worded planks for their platform, trying to deceive us into believing that they would enforce the eighteenth amendment if we would put them into office. Let us not be trapped or betrayed by any such high-sounding phrases as State rights. Let us ask, Is it State rights or State wrong? And when you hear one of them pleading with the Government to let down the bars that more aliens should be permitted into our country, pleading tolerance for the foreigner, who in many cases has proven to be our worst lawbreaker, you know that that candidate does not have your interest and my interest at heart, and that all he wishes or desires is to get elected to office by any means, catering to the lowest elements within our country.

Another candidate says he does not approve of the eighteenth amendment, but will enforce it as long as it is a law. That candidate, as Governor of the Empire State, threw the weight of his great office in helping to repeal the enforcement act, which now makes it impossible to enforce the prohibitory law. And when murder after murder has been committed, because it was easy to obtain liquor, and when that candidate himself openly violates the prohibition law, he has the audacity to ask the law-abiding women of this country who uphold the laws to vote for him for President; but he is honest enough to say in advance, if he is elected he will use his great office to help bring about the repeal, nationally, of the eighteenth amendment as he did in his own State, and judging from his official State acts he would endeavor to carry out such a program to the letter.

Another of these candidates comes before us with a plea of excessive campaign expenditures, slush funds, intolerance, lambasting the Republicans for their commissions and omissions, saying that prohibition has no place in a political campaign.

Let us not be deceived by these tactics. Let us not forget how this same candidate fought woman suffrage, insulting and deriding us; how he fought the greatest leader the democracy has ever known, giving aid and comfort to our enemies in the time of war; and how he fought the League of Nations, the only instrument of peace; his bitter opposition to the Sheppard-Towner birth hygiene bill, which would bring to the mothers and babies of the country Federal and State cooperation for better and healthier citizens; and his cutting and sneering opposition to the great army of law-abiding women who stormed the Capitol in defense of the eighteenth amendment at the Senate hearings some months ago.

The time has come when we must decide for ourselves what we shall expect of our candidate. Let us determine how we can elect our candidate and then let us go from this convention determined to put over such a program, remembering that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

My friends, let us hesitate long before we vote for a "wet" candidate, now that we have outlawed the liquor traffic. Don't trust such a candidate, as we know that the liquor interests are powerful, aggressive, and universal in their attacks. Because to-night it enters an humble home to strike the roses from a woman's cheek, and to-morrow it challenges this Republic in the Halls of Congress. To-day it strikes a crust from the lips of a starving child, and to-morrow levies tribute from the Government itself.

There is no cottage in this Nation humble enough to escape it, no palace strong enough to shut it out. It defies the law when it can not coerce suffrage. It is flexible to cajole but merciless in victory. It is the mortal enemy of peace and order, the despoiler of men, the terror of women, the cloud that shadows the face of children, the demon that has dug more graves and sent more souls unshriven to judgment than all the pestilence that have wasted life since God sent the plagues to Egypt, and all the wars since Joshua stood beyond Jericho.

Oh, my countrymen and women, loving God and humanity, let us not bring this grand old country again under the domination of that power. It can profit no man by its return. It can uplift no industry, revive no interest, remedy no wrong. You know, and I know, that it can not.

It comes to destroy, and it shall profit mainly by the ruin of your sons and mine. It comes to mislead human souls and crush human hearts under its rumbling wheels. It comes to bring gray-haired mothers down in shame and sorrow to their graves. It comes to turn the wife's love into despair and her pride into shame. It comes to still the laughter on the lips of little children. It comes to stifle all the music of the home and fill it with silence and desolation. It comes to ruin your body and mind, to wreck your home, and it knows that it must measure its prosperity by the swiftness and certainty with which it wrecks this work. Trust no candidate labeled "Wet."

Now, for a moment let me review a few unquestioned facts that we may clearly see just what is necessary if the Democratic Party is to be victorious in 1928. We certainly can not win with a wet candidate.

Don't lose sight of the fact that money plays a prominent part in any campaign. In the Republican Party, through its Republican convention, which is really nothing more than a ratifying body of less than 20 representatives of the various trusts of the Nation who hold the money bags, and while large numbers of delegates and alternates are chosen to go to the convention these 20 have the ruling power and say what shall be done and what shall not be done, and they know what they want and how to get what they want, and the convention meekly falls right into line. It is an invisible government that rules this Nation.

Will Hays, who was President Harding's campaign manager, said at a banquet given for his successful efforts, when the cheering had died away, "Now, boys, the thing I want you all to remember is that it did not just happen; it was planned far in advance."

Now, those of us who have long memories wonder if the oil steals and the rest of the tactics of the invisible government were planned far in advance.

You are all familiar with what occurred in 1924 when our Democratic delegates and alternates went to the New York National Democratic Convention under the leadership of CORDELL HULL in perfect peace and harmony, were thrown into almost complete disorganization and confusion by these same powers of the invisible government where they reign supreme. There the sober counsels of the Democratic leaders, thrown together from 48 States and torn by a struggle over mere candidates, were led into a jumble of confused voices praising and denouncing candidates.

As we approach the election of 1928, again the American press is filled with articles urging the Democratic Party to pose as a "wet" party and urging the Democratic Party not to go astray on account of religion. I agree with that great Democratic leader, Senator Robert L. Owen, and say it is only a smoke screen of this invisible government hiding itself from view.

The attitude of the Democratic Party for law enforcement, including prohibition, was precisely right in 1924. The prohibition leaders asked nothing more and they wish nothing else now.

There is but one great issue upon which the Democratic Party can reasonably hope to win, and that is by defending America against the stand-pat Republican policy of illicit secret alliance with corrupt business men who are using the governing powers of the people and rule by proxy.

On the issue shall America be free and a government by the people and for the people, or shall America be enslaved by an invisible government of self-seeking moneycrats, the liberal and progressive forces of America can be aroused and united. If so united they could probably control three-fourths of the total vote.

As it is, the Progressive Republicans are usually coerced by the Republican machine organizations, and the Democrats do not cohere all of the progressives and liberals under one banner and are beaten. The stand-pat strategy is to "divide and conquer." The Democratic and Progressive strategy should be to "unite and conquer."

The invisible government, through their innumerable agencies, will resist any union of the liberal forces and will charge them with hostility to wealth.

The Democracy, the progressive and independent Republican is not the enemy of wealth. American wealth owes its very existence to the opportunities and protection afforded under a free, benign, and just democracy. Vast personal wealth has its limitations. It has great commercial and political power, but not supernatural intelligence, and when it is used to corrupt and control the Government itself for personal privileges and private profit at public expense the people must arise and defend themselves or pass into serfdom and industrial servitude.

In selecting a candidate as the standard bearer of our party the National Woman's Democratic Law Enforcement League ask our leaders, who will meet in a day or two with these facts before them, to choose a man whose private life as well as his political life be above reproach if they wish the support of the women of the party, because we are determined to support only such candidates as can bear close inspection both morally and politically.

In closing let me say the "wet" candidates must recognize that victory is impossible without harmony and that as long as they remain in the race the people will think only of their wet records.

It is our belief that if they would immediately withdraw, accompanied by a ringing call to harmony, it would receive nation-wide approval and result in sending a progressive constitutional Democrat to the White House. And if they have the interests of the party at heart rather than their own personal aggrandizement, they will heed the will of the majority.

#### "THE IMPERIAL RUSSIAN CONSPIRACY"

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the American Monthly commenting on a book written by former Senator Owen, entitled "The Imperial Russian Conspiracy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLAINE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

INCENDIARISM ON THE NEVA—SENATOR OWEN'S THOUGHT-EVOKING BOOK, "THE IMPERIAL RUSSIAN CONSPIRACY," CONTINUES TO STIR THE COUNTRY

The American Monthly, in its issue of August, 1927, dwelt briefly on United States Senator Robert L. Owen's penetrating book, "The Imperial Russian Conspiracy." Naturally so astounding and courageous a book must arouse lively interest here and abroad. It is remarkable to notice that the metropolitan press did not give as much space, comparatively speaking, to reviews of the Owen book as did the middle western papers. Among the latter, two voices stand out especially that should echo and reecho throughout the world.

The first of these articles, a searching study of Owen's book, was written by Cyril Arthur Player. It appeared in the Detroit (Mich.) News on August 28, under the heading:

#### RUSSO-FRENCH PACT CAUSED WORLD WAR

A conspiracy so gigantic in its scope, so appalling in its effect that all recorded history has not the like to offer, plunged the peoples of the world into the World War.

The millions for whom we still mourn, the millions whose wounds refuse to heal, the millions whose grief weeps lonely forever and forever, these were the innocent sacrifice to the cynical ambitions of a handful of imperial-minded statesmen.

Idealism was a catch phrase to hide the lies from credulous peoples marked for slaughter. There was no war to end war. Not war for democracy.

The World War was a selfish plot against the peace of the world for which the common peoples paid in blood and suffering and wretchedness whose sum and duration is not yet computed.

The weapon with which little greed struck at the heart of civilization was secret diplomacy. By this means a few men controlling one

great nation were able to conspire with a few men controlling another. The weapon has been blunted but not destroyed. What was possible then is possible now. The world must face the truth and forbid it.

Robert L. Owen, former United Senator from Oklahoma, offers the proof of these things. Moved "alone by my love for the people of the United States" he sets the awful case forth in his book, *The Russian Imperial Conspiracy, 1892-1914* (Alfred & Charles Boni). Obviously it is a sensational indictment. Unfortunately for history and its myths, the main case as Senator Owen presents it, with his evidence, is incontrovertible. There was such a conspiracy. It cost the lives of millions. It all but wrecked civilization.

#### SUPPORTED BY PROOF

This is a story which, supported by proof which is indubitable, commands the attention of every human being capable of sharing the sorrows of civilization, past or future. It transcends all prejudice of nationality. For no people, neither German nor French, neither Russian nor English, neither Austrian nor Italian, was guilty of willing this war. They paid for it, are paying for and will continue to pay for it.

Mr. Owen himself says that the common people everywhere "were patriotic, brave, and determined to defend their own homes, but they did not have the will to invade their neighbors' territory for profit."

But a group of Russian imperialists and a few French leaders did plan for 20 years to make war on Germany. The roots of the war are to be found in the spirit of "excessive nationalism, militarism, and imperialism built up through the centuries." But the precipitating cause was cold-bloodedly arranged as the results of the secret treaty between Russia and France in 1892-1894.

It was part of the plot that hypocrisy should baffle the common intelligence with lies and fix the moral guilt on the German people. So a gigantic falsehood was written into the treaty of Versailles.

Beyond these things, Senator Owen essays to establish that during the years in which the conspiracy was matured, the French press was subsidized with Russian money, borrowed from the French people and expended under the French minister of foreign affairs, whereby the French people were induced to buy \$7,000,000,000 of Russian bonds, which were employed in building up a huge Russian army, to manufacture supplies of heavy and light artillery and munitions of war, to double track their railways to the German border, for the purpose of carrying out the military conventions of making offensive war on Germany.

#### ENCIRCLED BY TREATIES

To make certain the success of this gigantic conspiracy, the author continues, Germany was encircled with a series of treaties or understandings between Russia and France, between Russia and Rumania, Russia and Bulgaria, Russia and Italy, Russia and Great Britain, France and Great Britain, France and Belgium, so that Germany was completely surrounded on land and sea.

He then asserts that Sir Edward Grey's secret commitments to France made Britain an accessory to the war; hence the eve of war found the British fleet in possession of the North Sea and the French fleet already withdrawn into the Mediterranean.

As part of the strategy to throw the moral influence of the world against Germany, Germany was made to appear as guilty of having started the war. This was done by mobilizing the troops of Russia through a general mobilization order (the military equivalent of a declaration of war by Russia, but not so understood by the public), which called to the Russian colors 14,000,000 men and concentrated such masses of Russian troops against the German border that the military leaders of Germany, as a military necessity, had no option whatever except to recognize what was a fact, "a state of war existing." This was only done on August 1, 1914, at 7 p. m., after the Russian mobilization had been in progress for approximately eight days.

Immediately Germany took this official step, desired by the conspirators, Mr. Owen continues, Germany was blockaded by land and sea and the most gigantic propaganda the world has ever known was begun by the Entente Allies to prove to the world that the German leaders were solely responsible for the war; that the German purpose was to conquer Europe and to become the military dictator of the world; that the Germans were waging war with fiendish cruelty.

The conspiracy of the Russian and French leaders succeeded completely. Most of the world believed Germany guilty, even over the unceasing protests of Germany, and when the treaty of Versailles was written in June, 1919, the German Government was compelled by military force to confess that Germany had imposed war on the Allies.

"Such a confession," remarks the author, "so extorted, has in history no equal in the magnitude of its injustice. This confession of guilt should be removed and the world brought back to understanding, truth, and good will."

For, he adds, "the reconciliation of the French heartfelt moral disarmament is essential to physical disarmament; their mutual respect and good will are vital to their future peace and the future peace of Europe and the world."

In this narrative Senator Owen is following the trail blazed conspicuously by Harry Elmer Barnes, who, in turn, owed much to the researches of Sidney P. Fay. The English historian, G. P. Gooch, and



the Canadian jurist, John S. Ewart, also have made illuminating contributions; and many others have helped. The source material of all of them, now combined and digested by Senator Owen, comprises the secret archives of all the nations concerned, excepting only those of the Republic of France, whose story, however, is revealed by the documents exposed by the other nations, particularly in the contents of the Russian archives.

The value of Senator Owen's contribution is that he is not a professional historian; he ignores, even at the cost of superficial error, the technical dialogue of the textbook analyst, and even yields occasionally to the treacherous rhetoric of indignation and its inevitably unsound conclusions. But he is an American citizen, looking with undisguised horror at something that has shocked him. His anger is that of every man. His voice is the voice of the public. The terms he employs are in the common tongue. The fundamentals, he declares, are those cherished most dearly by humanity. He is of those who were deceived and who paid.

The conspiracy which plunged the world into carnage was this: During the year 1892 the governing group of Russian imperialists and a few men at the head of the French Government discussed a secret treaty. The chief clause provided that in the event any member of the triple alliance mobilized France and Russia would consider that the same is a declaration of war and would immediately mobilize against Germany. The treaty was concluded in 1894.

Gradually the shadow of the balance of power began to fall across Europe until in each great country of Europe jealous and suspicious leaders stood guard, hatching rumors into crises.

In 1908 there had happened something too remote for the purposes of Senator Owen's exposure, but nevertheless essential to the complete story.

Austria took from Turkish rule the Slav Provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina and annexed them to the dual monarchy. How did that come about? Isvolsky, the "damned soul" of the great conspiracy, then Russia's foreign minister, suggested it. Why did Isvolsky, a Russian minister, suggest this change of ownership for Slav peoples, presumably entitled to protection from the Great Slav Empire? Isvolsky believed that he could buy therewith Europe's acquiescence in Russia's age-long ambition for the straits and at the same time would be weakening Turkey, the power holding the coveted territory.

#### RUSSIA BLOCKED

As it happened the powers (chiefly Great Britain) blocked Russian ambition in that direction, and Russia felt chagrined. Russian leaders also expressed resentment that Russia had failed to protect the lesser Slav peoples. These leaders were ignorant of the part Isvolsky had played. This crafty man fanned the indignation of his coimperialists. Austria thus became the "oppressor of Slav peoples"; the subject Slav peoples became the necessary pot to stir into the fumes of disorder, rebellion, assassination.

Isvolsky found Raymond Poincaré in power, and Poincaré could say: "I have not been able to see any other reason for my generation living except the hope of recovering our lost Provinces."

The twin spirits reassured each other that the treaty of 1892-1894 was a valid instrument, and a secret one. The two groups drew together and planned the event which should fulfill the dreams of two nationalisms.

Russia had imperialistic and Pan-Slavic ambitions. She desired to dominate the Near East, to control the straits leading from the Black Sea to the Aegean, and to draw under her diplomatic ægis the lesser Slav peoples of Europe. These aspirations cut directly across the major ambitions and policies of the polyglot dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary, whose very existence depended upon repressing or debating the Slav nationalism on a large portion of her population. It is scarcely necessary to argue whether Austria-Hungary should have continued to exist. As Professor Barnes has pointed out, the Austrian and German authorities are to be forgiven for thinking that it should.

Then began the task of building up understandings with all the neighbors of the Central Powers, notably with Great Britain, whose foreign minister, wittingly or unwittingly, was to make himself and his country the servant of Franco-Russian imperialism.

#### STIR UP UNREST

The same Isvolsky whose counsel gave the Slavs to Austria now employed those Slavs as the excuse for the war at which the conspiracy now aimed. Constant and violent unrest produced assassinations; finally that of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife. It was a moment when the tension of Europe had built itself up to the breaking point. The diplomatic background constructed by secret diplomacy made a conflict inevitable once an important crucial issue arose between the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente.

The conspirators, all their military plans carefully arranged in a series of conferences, some of the minutes of which Senator Owen cites, produced the crucial issue. Ferdinand was assassinated.

The days between that event and the beginning of hostilities brought into open position all the arrangements so meticulously perfected through 20 years. England made good Grey's secret entangle-

ments and went to war against Germany and beside France. Colonel House, a few months earlier, had said: "The moment England consents, France and Russia will close in on Germany." England had consented.

Italy, only a member of the Triple Alliance, out of pique at French annexation of Tunis, marched against her "natural" enemy, Austria, in quest of Italia Irredenta.

Nothing had been left to chance—not even the blame for it.

There are grave things involved in the discussion of those last pre-war days. Great names are brought in question. Through what glasses of prejudice or imperial need did Grey survey the situation? Where did Henry Morgenthau get his account of the "decisive" Potsdam Conference? What was the notorious Potsdam Conference? The documents now show this: On July 5, as William II prepared to leave for his northern cruise, Chancellor Bethmann Hollweg sent this message to Vienna: "Austria may judge what is to be done to clear up her relations with Serbia; whatever Austria's decision may turn out to be, Austria can count with certainty upon it that Germany will stand behind her as an ally and friend."

#### REGRETS TOO LATE

Three weeks later, when events had brought the Kaiser back to Berlin, and it became apparent that tragedy was near, William II bitterly repented the message and the effect of it. The evidence bears out the claim that he made every effort to moderate and restrain Austria. It was too late, but it would not have been if Russia and France had not determined to force war upon Germany.

These talks of William II with Hollweg, Falkenhayn, and Zimmermann constitute the "Potsdam conference." The papers show that William II conceived only of Austria administering punishment to Serbia. They show that he accepted Serbia's reply to Austria's ultimatum as wholly gratifying to Austria. They show him frantically apprehensive when it became positive that peace was at an end.

Unquestionably Austria's conduct was perverse, determined, and arbitrary. However, to the Dual Monarchy the issue was a life and death proposition. That is obvious. Isvolsky, with less reason, urged that the upholding of the Slavs by Russia also was a life and death matter. The actualities of the time support Austria, without justifying either.

Finally, Senator Owen quotes sufficient from the archives to show that French and Russian mobilization was hurried in advance of declaration of war, so that, as outlined earlier, Germany found herself faced by a fact, and so in self-defense was forced to take up the challenge.

It goes for the saying that in each country, not least in Germany, there was a group of war spirits to welcome a war. The spirit of militarism existed everywhere; and raw nerves; long-sustained apprehensions; and the deadly and precarious balance of power.

Nevertheless, it is established by these documents that the Russian imperialists and a group of French statesmen did plan to control this nervous tension of Europe and direct it so that it would annihilate a nation for their own imperial aggrandisement. An analysis of each country involved shows little but sordid motive at bottom. Neither in Russia, France, nor Britain was it necessary for a government to reveal to parliament its secret treaties. That is true in France and Britain to-day. The fatally mischievous influence of Isvolski and the cold-blooded calculation of a few French leaders and of the unscrupulous group around the Czar are placed beyond question. Secret diplomacy delivered the millions into their hands.

#### EXPLODES "ATROCITIES"

As for the war lies, the "atrocities," and the like, Senator Owen takes the trouble to explode some of the more notorious, although the American public has been miserably conscious for a long time that the hysteria of war has to be fed by an unspeakable diet of mendacity and exaggeration.

Not the least disheartening phase of the story is the apparently easy corruption of the French press. In one letter Isvolsky asks his government to provide 3,000,000 francs (\$600,000) to hand the papers controlled by radical Socialists. His letter—written in July, 1912—begins: "From this interview I was convinced that M. Poincaré—then premier—is in every respect in accord with us, considers the moment has finally arrived to realize the century-old aims of our traditional policy—seizure of Constantinople and the Straits—and therewith restore the European balance of power by the return of the stolen Provinces of Alsace-Lorraine. In order to control the newspaper mouthpieces of prominent Socialists, Poincaré shares my opinion that a very large sacrifice on our part is necessary for this purpose."

He hesitates to name the sum—3,000,000 francs—but reminds the Czar's advisers that "the Turkish Government has spent 5,000,000 francs to influence the French press and bought even one of their most prominent authors, Pierre Loti. . . . I propose that the subsidy be paid in monthly installments as heretofore in order to be sure every minute of the zeal of the newspapers."

Sazonoff replies from St. Petersburg that the plan is approved, to which Isvolski sends an acknowledgment, adding concerning the distribution of the money: "It is very important not to undertake any-

thing without consulting Poincare. French statesmen are practiced in such matters and possess incredible adroitness."

Raffalowitch, the Russian distributor of newspaper graft in Paris, duly sent in his expense account, November 7, 1913, as follows:

	Francs
La Lanterne (Millerand's paper).....	42,000
L'Aurore (Clemenceau's paper).....	17,000
L'Evenement.....	11,000
L'Action.....	9,000
La France.....	11,000
Le Rappel.....	7,000
Le Gil Blas.....	2,000
Le Journal.....	1,000

Two weeks later the agent's report showed that the cost of journalistic zeal had mounted:

Millerand's paper is credited with 85,000 francs.

Clemenceau's with 45,000.

Le Radical gets 120,000.

Le Figaro, 25,000.

Le Temps, 50,000.

La Libre Parole, 80,000.

Le Gaulois, 25,000.

La Liberty, 30,000.

Raffalowitch also reminds Isvolsky: I have already informed your excellency that Lenoir, at the instigation of Klotz, who herein is Poincare's mouthpiece, has pledged himself firmly toward the journals L'Aurore, La Lanterne, Le Radical, etc., as well as to certain directors of journals having but small editions, but great influence in politics."

#### ABOUT PEOPLE

Senator Owens sums up: "It was under these subsidies of the French press that the French people were worked up by special writers to believe that it was to the interest of France to support Russia in defending Serbia on the pretense of maintaining the 'balance of power' in the Balkans, while Russian money in Serbia had excited the intrigues of Serbia, which led to the assassination of numerous Austrian officials (finally of the Archduke Ferdinand) and compelled Austria to mobilize against Serbia in self-protection. This local act of war of Austria against Serbia was used then as a pretext for Russian general mobilization, which really meant a secret declaration of war by Russia and France against Germany, as shown by the contract of 1892-1894, the military conferences, and the secret dispatches already published."

Senator Owen, having marshaled his documents, places the moral responsibility for the war on Sazonoff, Nicholas II, Grand Duke Nicholas, Isvolsky, and Poincare. "But," he remarks, "it would be a grave mistake to permit a discussion of this great question to generate into stigmatizing leaders, however much they erred." He insists, however, that "the official proof is overwhelming that the Germans did not will the World War; that the Austrians did not will the World War; that the leaders of Serbia, of Russia, and a very, very few French leaders, controlling nevertheless French foreign affairs, did will the World War."

#### SECRET DIPLOMACY

Translating this into terms of philosophy, he suggests the spirit of excessive nationalism, militarism, and imperialism, cultivated by the leaders in Europe, as mainly responsible, and adds: "If the democracies or peoples of the world continue to permit secret diplomacy, with its ambitious intrigue, militarism, commercial imperialism, this World War will not be the last." In another place, remarking that the Russian conspiracy has greatly advanced government by the people, he adds that "the greatest need of the world now is that government by the people should be strenuously supplemented by education of the people."

In the end there comes the disturbing reflection that if Senator Owen's case were only half true, if there existed nothing more than the cold-blooded conspiracy to war, plotted by a few Russian and French leaders, then the author is correct in asserting that the theory that the war was waged in defense of American ideals was untrue. He is even more convincingly correct when he indicts the treaty of Versailles with its betrayal of President Wilson's pledges (in the 14 points) to the German people.

Senator Owen believes that "the establishment of the truth as to the origin of the World War is vital to a reconciliation of the people of Europe." He thinks that just as the American people were gravely deceived by European propaganda as to the origin and the purposes of the World War, so they are now being subjected to a similar propaganda for the cancellation of the war debts. He thinks that all the common peoples, German as well as others, are indistinguishable in honest purpose and are equally worthy of American interest and sympathy.

Senator Owen, a fair-minded man, powerfully moved, his earlier convictions overturned, sets forth impressively this colossal story of the world's betrayal. During recent years men's minds have been revolving uneasily the theme to which he now brings, condensed and assembled, the truth. It has been a long time coming. But, declared Schopenhauer, "the truth can wait. It has a long life before it."

The second article reprinted here is an editorial, also from the Detroit (Mich.) News, published on August 29, and entitled:

#### THE WORST COLOSSAL CRIME OF ALL TIMES

"No question is ever settled until it is settled right."

The most devastating tragedy of all time is not settled right, and on the conscience of every honest man and woman must rest the burden of a colossal betrayal.

The revelation of the stupendous conspiracy by a handful of Russian and French statesmen, categorically established by Senator Robert L. Owen, is not the work of a pamphleteer. It is the voice of an indignant world which has just discovered that its finest emotions have been employed to set the common people everywhere to butchering each other, not for those splendid ideals for which men and women, through all time, have sought glorious martyrdom, but to fulfill the coldly calculating ambitions of a few powerful and wicked men.

Is it possible that the memories of that appalling war already are buried under the tinsel of prosperity? Are there no homes in this land, as in others, whence youth has gone forever, or else has returned to drag its crippled symbol miserably through life? For what was this sublimest of sacrifices, this utter renunciation of life and health and opportunity and the sweet things which bloom in the hearts of the happy and well? Was it the world's grandest gesture of heroism in defense of man's priceless liberties? That were a fight, indeed! The widow and the orphan could be glad for it. The stricken home could be forever an altar consecrated to the hopes of humanity. For this very threshold, for this hearth, for this cradle, to protect all this precious sum of dear life, youth marched to war and died.

The evidence says, cruelly, no.

The glory is no less bright, for the lives were generously given in faith. Only the background grows dark and murky. These cold and crafty men, all powerful, sitting quietly in their council room and watching; whispering secret things one to another; plotting craftily the ruin of the world; dropping the poison of distrust and hatred; thrusting weapons into the nervous, ready hands of patriot-assassins; setting the time clock of destiny so that in the end the explosion might flame and tear itself across the earth, at least to destroy one people. And when this very thing came dreadfully to pass, the little group still sitting at their table, smiling, congratulating each other, tracing, and verifying the new lines on the map.

A terrible story. Humanity has nothing to set beside it; only its tears. A story that rises above nationality and commands the scrutiny and judgment of every human being capable of suffering, past or future. A story that can not be ignored, that demands refutation syllable for syllable—and can not be refuted.

It is true. Men could make this plot. Neither in France nor in Russia, nor for that matter in England, could Parliament demand those secrets. A few men, ruling, could conspire against hundreds of millions of innocent people, and molding passions to their need by the expenditure of untold millions with a venal French press, precipitate a carnage incomparable and a hatred which still harasses the world.

"No question is ever settled until it is settled right."

No people, German, or French, or Russian, or Austrian, or English, willed that war. Neither did the German Government will it. When Colonel Picquard told General Gonse that an error had been committed in the Dreyfus case, Gonse replied: "If you hold your tongue no one will know anything about it." But the innocence of Dreyfus became apparent by the collapse of the proofs upon which he was condemned. It is the same with Germany to-day. The archives of the world, excepting those of France, have not held their tongue.

The future peace of the world, the happiness of those boys and girls who even now are preparing to enter another year of school in preparation for a useful, happy, and prosperous life, demands that the American people face these facts, regardless of origin or birth, of any prejudice or conviction. The peace of the world must no longer rest with conspirators. The people sometimes blundering but always in the last analysis honest and friendly, must hold the power over their own lives and happiness which secret diplomacy robbed away. This most colossal crime in all history must not be repeated.

"No question is ever settled until it is settled right."

#### IMPORTATION OF BROKEN RICE

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) to define broken rice. Its consideration will take but a moment. If it leads to any debate, I shall not press it.

Mr. JONES. Was the concurrent resolution reported from the Committee on Finance?

Mr. RANDELL. No; it was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but the chairman of the Committee on Finance said that its adoption is entirely satisfactory to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "only," to strike out "the class 'Brewers Milled Rice' as specified in the united standards for



milled rice" and to insert in lieu thereof "rice which falls within the class 'Brewers Milled Rice' as defined in the United States standards for milled rice as promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture," so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

*Resolved, etc.,* That for the purpose of interpreting the meaning of the tariff act of 1922, with respect to imported broken rice, "broken rice" shall include only rice which falls within the class "Brewers Milled Rice" as defined in the United States standards for milled rice as promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 13, 1928, at 12 o'clock m.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 12 (legislative day of January 11), 1928*

##### FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 2

Addison E. Southard, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 2, of the United States of America.

##### SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

William W. Schott, of Kansas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a consular officer with the rank of consul, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

George T. McDermott, of Kansas, to be United States district judge, district of Kansas. (An additional appointment, under the provisions of section 375, United States Code.)

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harry B. Amey, of Vermont, to be United States attorney, district of Vermont. (A reappointment, his term having expired.)

##### UNITED STATES MARSHALS

George W. Collier, of Maryland, to be United States marshal, district of Maryland. (A reappointment, his term having expired.)

George A. Mauk, of Arizona, to be United States marshal, district of Arizona. (A reappointment, his term having expired.)

James A. Stafford, of Alabama, to be United States marshal, southern district of Alabama, vice John W. Van Heuvel, term expired.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 12 (legislative day of January 11), 1928*

##### POSTMASTERS

###### COLORADO

John M. Miller, Campo.

###### ILLINOIS

Clarence E. Snively, Canton.

Stanley L. Ryno, Easton.

Percy W. Armstrong, Glencoe.

Leo M. Stoecklin, Highland.

William R. Gaddis, Lomax.

Frank H. Creswick, Mulberry Grove.

William J. West, Odin.

Elgin C. Spivey, Shawneetown.

Ernest W. Loehr, Waterloo.

###### KENTUCKY

Lloyd M. McCubbin, Hodgenville.

George W. Murphy, Livingston.

Claude T. Winslow, Mayfield.  
John M. Miller, Middlesboro.  
Henry B. Morehead, Morgantown.  
John B. Hutcheson, Owenton.  
Don C. Van Hoose, Paintsville.

##### MASSACHUSETTS

William H. Anderson, Monson.  
Harry S. Tripp, Spencer.

##### OHIO

Albert H. Soles, Buchtel.  
Harry H. Hover, Lakeview.  
Frank B. Pauly, Middletown.  
Ira R. Kneisly, Osborn.  
Nora Kassell, Philo.

##### OREGON

Lyle B. Chappell, North Bend.  
Josephine T. Stark, Sutherlin.  
Charles R. Tyler, Yamhill.

#### WITHDRAWALS

*Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate January 12 (legislative day of January 11), 1928*

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

George T. McDermott, of Kansas, to be United States district judge, district of Kansas, vice John C. Pollock, retired.

##### POSTMASTER

###### TEXAS

Alice Pipes to be postmaster at White Deer, in the State of Texas.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, January 12, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We approach Thee now, O Soul of our souls. As we have in ourselves the power to love and the longing to do, how much more shall we find in Thee the same love and power! Oh, the pity of it when we fail to bow to our higher natures and neglect to live out the divine life. Help us to check the minor strain that often runs low and sound the note of the ministry of our best manhood. We beseech Thee to always help us carry it up to spiritual culture and beauty. We acknowledge our responsibility of our time and place, and ask for full power to transform all fruitless wastes into gardens of promise and gladness. Lord God of nations, bless our entire country and all institutions that make for a better national life. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

##### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

##### House Resolution 88

*Resolved,* That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to wit:

Phil D. Swing, California; Guy E. Campbell, Pennsylvania; Harry E. Rowbottom, Indiana; to rank with the other majority members on said committee in the following order:

William Williamson (chairman), South Dakota; Clarence MacGregor, New York; Carroll L. Beedy, Maine; Don B. Colton, Utah; Phil D. Swing, California; Guy E. Campbell, Pennsylvania; Godfrey D. Goodwin, Minnesota; F. D. Letts, Iowa; Harry E. Rowbottom, Indiana; Frederick W. Dallinger, Massachusetts; John C. Schafer, Wisconsin; J. Russel Leech, Pennsylvania; Thomas C. Cochran, Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution for the relief of Henry A. Bellows;

S. 3. An act for the relief of Kate Mathews;

S. 120. An act to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Clara E. Nichols;

S. 342. An act for the relief of George B. Booker Co.;

S. 434. An act for the relief of Sadie Klauber;

S. 440. An act for the relief of Charles H. Send; and

S. 672. An act for the purpose of rehabilitating farm lands in the flood areas.

## INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9136) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes. Pending that I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] whether or not it will be agreeable to him to let the general debate run along to-day and fix the limitation later after matters have developed?

Mr. HASTINGS. That will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, pending the motion I have made, I ask unanimous consent that the control of the time in general debate be divided equally between the gentleman from Oklahoma and myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, and pending that asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be not fixed at this time and that the control of the time in general debate be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, with Mr. CHINBLOM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule of the House the time for general debate will be equally controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS]. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us for the Interior Department is one of the most interesting bills that goes through the Committee on Appropriations, and to some sec-

tions of the country it is of the greatest importance. The problems of the West, the protection and the development of public-land areas, the care of the Indians, the development of the national parks, a great part of the work of the Geological Survey, are of particular importance to a large section of the country.

It has been my fortune to present this bill as chairman of this subcommittee for six years preceding this. In all of that work during that time, and in the preparation of the bill this year, I have been most fortunate in having with me on my subcommittee colleagues most delightful in association, and whose knowledge of the subject before us was such as to relieve me very greatly of responsibility. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] and myself are the tenderfeet on the subcommittee, but we have been fortunate in having with us for a long time Mr. TAYLOR, of Colorado, and Mr. FRENCH, of Idaho. We have been glad this year to welcome to this subcommittee, and have found of great assistance, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS]. [Applause.] If the work of this subcommittee finds any merit in your eyes I am very frank to say that these four colleagues are entitled to the credit.

For the Interior Department we appropriated for the current year, including the deficiency bill that recently passed the Congress, \$311,176,821.

The Budget recommends for 1929, \$273,118,589. The amount in the bill before you, as recommended by the committee, is \$272,430,789, which is \$38,746,032 less than the appropriation for the current year and \$687,800 less than the amount submitted in the estimates.

It is \$38,746,032 less than the 1928 appropriations and \$687,800 less than the amount requested in the estimates.

The decrease in the total appropriations recommended for 1929 under the amount appropriated for 1928 is accounted for in the main by the decrease of \$37,078,000 under the Pension Office and \$2,706,977 under the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Other decreases are \$219,735 under the National Park Service, \$159,500 under the General Land Office, \$49,800 under the Geological Survey, \$21,000 under Government in the Territories, and so forth, and \$15,400 in the Secretary's office. The increases recommended for 1929 over the amounts appropriated for 1928 are \$775,200 under the Reclamation Service, \$20,080 under the Bureau of Education, \$384,000 for St. Elizabeths Hospital, \$16,600 for Columbia Institution for the Deaf, \$22,000 for Howard University, and \$286,500 for Freedmen's Hospital.

Comparing the appropriations proposed by the committee with the estimates proposed in the Budget, increases are \$117,500 under the Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$94,700 under the National Park Service, \$40,000 under the Geological Survey, \$26,500 under the Bureau of Education, and \$10,000 under the Freedmen's Hospital. The decreases are \$976,000 under the Reclamation Service and \$500 under the General Land Office.

To that is to be added, however, a decrease of the burden on the Federal Treasury which does not show in the figures I have mentioned, amounting to \$247,000 in the case of the Freedmen's Hospital, which I shall discuss later in my remarks. There is also covered back to the Treasury \$61,082.12 of appropriations made in 1904, 1909, 1910, 1913, 1914, 1916, 1921, and 1922, and available until expended, but not longer required.

I will insert for the information of the House a tabulation which I am sure you would not want me to read at this time. It is an analysis of the expenditures of this department, beginning with the year 1922, the beginning of the Budget period, and continuing up to date, by bureaus, giving the total expenditure for the department, the total expenditure for the department outside of pensions, and the total expenditure outside of the payment of pensions and reclamation expenditures.

Appropriations for Department of the Interior, 1922-1929

Year	Secretary's office	Land Office	Indian Bureau	Pension Bureau	Reclamation Bureau	Geological Survey	National Park Service	Bureau of Education
1922	\$2,131,070	\$3,125,015	\$10,342,304	\$266,830,920	\$20,277,000	\$1,614,340	\$1,433,220	\$586,960
1923	1,572,920	2,954,550	10,134,852	254,246,191	14,800,000	1,450,940	1,446,520	621,960
1924	1,461,020	2,942,660	11,317,655	254,774,660	12,250,000	1,670,190	1,689,730	644,260
1925	1,693,240	2,940,820	11,276,220	224,616,000	12,867,500	1,706,482	2,880,535	702,380
Field classification		259,180	1,653,061		373,020	28,941	102,122	72,735
Total, 1925		3,200,000	12,929,281	224,616,000	13,240,520	1,735,423	2,982,657	775,115
1926	797,585	2,633,590	11,918,270	199,095,000	9,999,000	1,879,310	3,218,409	794,495
1927	803,000	2,342,300	12,901,160	193,921,000	7,556,000	1,816,440	3,698,920	864,100
1928	865,600	2,297,550	16,421,486	208,816,000	11,953,800	1,807,880	4,874,685	921,220
1929	850,200	2,138,050	13,714,509	231,738,000	12,729,600	1,758,080	4,654,950	941,300

\* Proposed in accompanying bill.



## Appropriations for Department of the Interior, 1922-1929—Continued

Year	Territories, government in	St. Elizabeths Hospital	Columbia Institution for the Deaf	Howard University	Freedmen's Hospital	Miscellaneous	Total	Total, exclu- sive of Pen- sions and Reclamation	Total, exclu- sive of Pen- sions
1922	\$4,028,950	\$1,114,500	\$106,000	\$280,000	\$116,020		\$311,986,290	\$26,709,299	\$46,986,299
1923	4,618,620	1,100,000	104,000	190,000	118,555	\$8,016	293,367,124	26,567,124	41,367,124
1924	2,150,540	1,146,500	107,000	232,500	172,800	\$2,845,309	293,404,824	31,154,824	43,404,824
1925	1,314,310	1,008,000	109,000	365,000	174,700		261,541,687	24,170,987	39,534,146
Field classification	6,600						2,608,459	2,122,639	
Total, 1925	1,320,910	1,008,000	109,000	365,000	174,700		264,150,146	28,409,626	41,650,146
1926	1,912,237	1,023,000	113,400	591,000	202,950		234,178,246	27,179,246	37,178,246
1927	1,995,708	924,000	113,400	218,000	166,390		227,323,418	27,767,418	35,323,418
1928	1,620,200	929,000	113,400	368,000	188,000		311,176,821	32,223,021	44,176,821
1929 <sup>1</sup>	1,599,200	1,313,000	130,000	390,000	474,500		272,430,789	49,701,789	42,480,789

<sup>1</sup> Proposed in accompanying bill.<sup>2</sup> Miscellaneous relief acts.<sup>3</sup> Increase of compensation.<sup>4</sup> Does not include \$19,950,000 appropriated to the civil-service retirement fund.

I am sure the House will be interested in that tabulation, and I am sure the House will be satisfied that in this department—a great constructive department, handling many important problems, and a department in which the expenditures were not increased materially, if at all, during the World War, and hence did not have that inflation to overcome in these days of economy—I am sure you will be satisfied that there is a real economy in the conduct of that department.

The opening of the report of the Secretary reads:

## THE YEAR'S WORK IN BRIEF

The department has had a productive year in work performed. After four years of effort in consolidating and coordinating activities, reducing the personnel to a point more nearly commensurate with the needs of the service, and discontinuing unnecessary activities, the department has become a more compact, efficient organization than theretofore. During this period of reconstruction many offshoots of bureaucratic control have been abandoned. These were characterized by the magnified importance of nonessential activities and in cumbersome methods of transacting the legitimate work of the department.

The accomplishments in these directions are represented in dollars and cents by the saving of \$131,331,871.61 in operation expenditures for the four years, but further by the reduction in force of 2,722 permanent employees and an increased output in the specific functions delegated to the department by law.

I fear possibly that some of you, if you read the report of the Secretary, might not understand just what the Secretary means in the beginning of that report. I have not been quite able to understand it myself. It says that the accomplishments in the direction of discontinuing unnecessary activities, and so forth, are represented in dollars and cents by the saving of \$131,000,000 in operation expenses for the four years.

A study of the above table will show that expenditures of the department outside of the payment of pensions do not much exceed \$40,000,000 a year, and have not during the period of four years stated, and this alleged decrease of \$131,000,000 in those expenses, which is stated to be "in the operating expenses of the department," I do not quite understand. No doubt there is an explanation, but I am not able to give it. I would not consider that the reduction in the fund for the payment of pensions was a reduction in the operating cost of the department, and perhaps someone, not understanding that, might not appreciate the real showing of economy which the department makes, as you will do if you study the table I have given.

## GENERAL LAND OFFICE

There is one bureau in the department to which I think I should call special attention in this connection, because we get the idea that an expenditure once entered upon is never ended. Furthermore, that there is no branch of the Government that is really reducing its expenditures. Many of the bureaus have an expanding work, which means increased expenditures. There are some that have a practically stationary program. But there are others that ought to pinch out, but they do not do it.

Let me call your attention to a notable exception, the General Land Office, under the administration of a splendid type of western manhood, a former Governor of Utah, Mr. Spry. The expenses of the bureau, with the economies carried forth by Governor Spry, with the complete support and approval of the Secretary of the Interior, show a reduction in the expenditures of the General Land Office from \$3,125,015 in 1925 to \$2,138,050 in 1929. [Applause.] There is a reduction of practically a million dollars, fully 30 per cent, in the operating cost of that bureau.

## BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Indian Service is one of the most difficult branches of the Government service. I think the Commissioner of Indian

Affairs has the hardest, most thankless job in the whole Federal service. He must meet, on the one hand, the criticism of those who are in contact with the Indian, in a position to exploit the Indian and having the desire to do so. I do not want to be understood as saying that all who are in contact have that desire, but I am speaking of that element of those who are in contact who do have that desire and who are ready to raise any kind of a cry, true or not, whenever their fingers are pinched when they are reaching in to get something from the Indians for themselves.

There is another element that makes more trouble for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and for the Government in carrying on a sane and progressive policy of rehabilitation for the Indian, and that is the many, many people throughout the country whose only knowledge of the Indian is as they have read about him, who have pictured romantic ideas of him, and who cherish an altruistic desire to see this Government do everything for the Indian; splendid people, many of them in high positions in social, political, and industrial life and who, having this desire, are frequently exploited, I may say, by men who, to make jobs for themselves or to make trouble for the Government, are constantly parading before the country alleged shortcomings of the Government.

Now, I have in mind one such organization that is perhaps the most active and the most destructive of those organizations, and that is the American Indian Defense Association. On its letterhead are the names of many splendid men and women whose only fault is that they have permitted their names to be exploited in a mistaken cause, playing into the hands of the secretary of the association, one John Collier.

John Collier is fundamentally a sensationalist and opponent of the Government. He does not, apparently, have any desire to do constructive things for the solution of the problem—certainly does not attempt them—and there are many such opportunities for such an organization, backed by such splendid men and women as he has back of him. No. He simply tears down. I say he is fundamentally against the Government, one of those who always is sure the Government of the United States is wrong and is doing wrong. He recently put out this pamphlet, *The Sacco and Vanzetti Horror*, by John Collier, under date of August 10, 1927. Whatever may have been its effect on public sentiment—possibly it had none—that was less destructive than this constant parading of propaganda in order to bring the Government into disfavor and disrepute in its handling of Indian affairs. [Applause.]

I am not an apologist for the Indian Bureau. I know very well that they must inevitably make mistakes from time to time in handling their widespread responsibilities. There are approximately 250,000 Indians, outside of the Five Civilized Tribes, with a total of property, tribal and individual, of \$1,716,815,000, of which \$920,000,000 is tribal and \$796,000,000 individual. Their individual property and tribal property have each increased constantly and is now at its highest figure. They live in dissimilar conditions, some of them in the hot desert wastes of the Southwest and some of them in the coldest winters of the Northwest. Some of them have much more money than it is good for them to have or good for anyone to have without earning it; many of them are destitute. Some of them are well advanced and others are in the lowest condition of civilization. With all of their reservations scattered over the great West it is inevitable that, through human agencies, occasional mistakes of administration will occur.

There was a time, I have read, in the earlier days, when we had just subdued the Indians, when the West was not as well developed as it is now, and when those regions were most remote from the seat of government, that the Indian Service

was notoriously corrupt; and I think in the public mind the Indian Service of to-day has the disadvantage of some of that ancient aroma still clinging around it.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Hon. Charles H. Burke, has had long experience with Indian affairs, through his life in the West and through his former connection with Indian affairs as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs of this House, and is a man of capacity, integrity, and of practical and sane idealism. He has associated with him, as assistant commissioner, Mr. Edgar B. Meritt, who has been in that bureau for some 30 years. I do not believe there is in the Government service a man who works harder and who is more sincerely devoted to the carrying out of the responsibilities of his position than Mr. Meritt. It was his vigilance that saved the San Carlos Reservoir site, and he is most zealous and devoted to the real welfare of the Indians. I do not believe there is a man more loyal in the discharge of his duties. The organization headed by Burke and Meritt is the organization that is under daily attack; and that attack is destructive and in some degree nullifies their constructive efforts.

A few months ago one of my colleagues, who is now sitting here before me, brought to my attention a circular issued by this Indian Defense organization. It was a circular prepared by its president, a physician in New York City, with reference to the death rate among the Indians. That circular, under date of January 28, 1927, stated, in so many words, that the death rate among the Indians has increased 48 per cent in four years. He purports to quote census statistics. I have not checked up those figures at the source, but I am one who will not accept tabulated figures when they go contrary to my own personal knowledge. There are many men in this House, every man who has been in contact with the Indian problem, who know that that statement is not true.

The gentleman in New York who put that forth, whether prepared by himself or by the secretary, John Collier, either knew it was giving the country a misunderstanding or else he did not know anything about the problem and should not have put out anything.

I have been on many reservations. I know of the effort the Government has been making during that very four years to increase and make more effective our health work among the Indians. I know that no such statement is true and that it has in it no element of truth.

The chief aim of the Indian Service in its health work is not only to more effectively care for and cure the sick, but also the establishment of a high standard of physical well-being and the raising of the vitality of the Indian race. Progress has been and is being made in this respect through application of preventive medicine and the teaching by precept and example of personal hygiene and home sanitation through the physicians, nurses, field matrons, hospital employees, and, in fact, all field employees, whether engaged in health, school, or agency work. By the raising of the standard of living, the problems of morbidity and mortality may be made less formidable.

In 1873 the first recognized steps were taken toward furnishing organized educational and medical facilities for the Indians. In this year an educational and medical division was established in the Indian Bureau. It could not be expected that the Indians would accept and take to scientific medical services in the same manner they accepted the white man's "fire water" and other vices. For generation upon generation they had relied upon their medicine men, with their weird incantations and practical knowledge gained by experience in the use of herbs, and so forth. But these white doctors were able at times of gatherings of the Indians at the agencies and trading post to extract teeth, lance boils, and perform other minor surgery, or perhaps render relief to old and infected wounds or illnesses which had defied the efforts of the medicine men. These small services gradually won favor among the Indians and gained their confidence, and a few Indians began calling upon the physicians. Little by little the services of the doctor came to be regarded more favorably. The medicine man and tribal custom still hold sway in some of the more remote sections, but are gradually losing favor.

With the increasing recognition of the value of the physicians' services, hospital facilities were found necessary, and attention to the provision of these facilities was made. In 1900 there were but five hospitals. There are now 100 hospitals and infirmaries, including those under construction or authorized in this bill. Now all but a few of the smaller reservations have hospital facilities, and efforts are being made to provide each of these with hospital facilities as rapidly as funds are available. The interest of the bureau in the expansion of this work is well emphasized in the report of the survey of medical

needs in the Southwest by Mr. Meritt, which appears in our hearings.

The first specific appropriation for health work of any amount was made by the act of February 20, 1909, and provided \$12,000 for the investigation, treatment, and prevention of trachoma. This sum was followed by an appropriation of \$40,000 for the relief of distress and conservation of health which became available July 1, 1910. From this small beginning there has been waged an unceasing warfare against the two great scourges of this primitive people—trachoma and tuberculosis—and Congress has seen fit from time to time to increase the sum available for health work until in this bill for the fiscal year 1929 there is provided the sum of \$1,434,500 for "conservation of health," with \$113,000 of tribal funds added for the same purpose.

To-day there are 13 special physicians traveling constantly through the West treating the Indians for trachoma, and progress is being made in its eradication. Other items were used, but the specific appropriation which began in 1909 at \$12,000 is in the bill that is before you—\$1,434,500 from the Treasury of the United States—in addition to a trifling sum from the tribal funds.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to ask the gentleman about how many Indians there are now?

Mr. CRAMTON. There are about 250,000; that is, outside of the Five Civilized Tribes, and there are 100,000 of those, making 353,000, as I recall.

Recently, and within the last two years, under the administration of Commissioner Burke, the medical service has been reorganized and a detail from the Public Health Service has come in, at its head Doctor Guthrie. So not only are we giving them more money but they are using it better and more effectively. If there is any item of grief in the Indian Service, and anything to which uplift organizations might well consecrate themselves for the purpose of getting some returns, it is the inadequacy of salaries in the Indian Service. That has been helped somewhat of late and we are now getting the benefit of it, but more is needed, especially in the positions of greatest responsibility.

Since I am on the subject, I came in contact while in the Southwest last fall with a man who had been nearly 40 years in the Indian Service, Mr. Charles L. Davis, the head of the White River Indian Agency for the Apaches. These Indians have a large reservation, 1,680,000 acres, or 2,625 square miles, \$4,000,000 of timber in their forests, some undeveloped coal and iron mines and asbestos, large grazing areas, a tribal herd of 2,300 cattle, with a probable income of \$10,000 from that herd for this year, as well as herds of permittees from which they get an income of over \$30,000 for 15,000 cattle and 30,000 sheep. They derived \$156,000 from timber last year. There are many individual Indians having substantial property interests, 500 individual Indians having a total of 21,650 head of stock from which their income this year is \$55,000.

I met an interesting delegation of them. When the Government made up the Apache roll, after the days of Geronimo, they put them into bands and lettered the bands and numbered the individual members, and they still go by that designation. A-1 was a scout under General Crook and is now the chief of the tribe.

His brother is the medicine man of the tribe and is A-2. I met R-14, a most interesting character. When the war was on the agent suggested to R-14 that he ought to buy some Liberty bonds. He said, "How many do you think I ought to buy?" The agent said, "I think you ought to buy \$10,000 worth." He came around in a day or two and said, "I will take \$25,000 of them." The bonds were bought and they are in the safe of the agent. It is interesting to note that the bank in which his money had been deposited broke after that and he was fortunate to have Liberty bonds instead of that deposit.

This will give you some idea of the responsibilities, the financial responsibilities, of such an agent. Joined to this is the tactfulness required in handling 2,000 or 3,000 temperamental individuals and taking care of them. There is an order of executive ability that is required; and what do you suppose such a man with all this responsibility upon him gets after 40 years in the service, a man who has discharged his duties in a most highly commendable fashion and in a way that would have brought him a very substantial income in private employment? As I recall, he was getting \$3,300 at the time of his retirement a few weeks ago.

You can not expect to get the highest type of service unless you are willing to pay somewhat nearly what it is worth; and these uplift organizations, if they would devote themselves



to some such constructive effort as this, could get somewhere, whereas now with this program of calumny and propaganda they are nothing but obstructionists and destroyers.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Would the gentleman mind telling the House the salary of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs for carrying on this great work?

Mr. CRAMTON. Seven thousand five hundred dollars for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and \$5,400 for the assistant.

In connection with this matter of health, I have stated we have increased the appropriation. We have increased the facilities most wonderfully. It has been the policy of this subcommittee, in which we have had the support thoroughly of the House, to each year have a material increase in this appropriation. New hospitals are constructed each year, and this requires an addition for their support; and then the next year more new hospitals and more for their support.

The birth rate—and I quote now from the hearings a statement presented by Doctor Guthrie, an official of the Public Health Service, and a gentleman of reliability and who has the contact and familiarity with this subject—you know the trouble with figures and statistics, when you come to the Indian question, it is very hard to take a census among the Indians, either those that are sick or well, particularly such tribes as the Navajos, who inhabit great, arid wastes and who are hidden away among the brush, more or less; and so I suppose, if I went out to get some figures to make a bad case, I could find them, but here is a gentleman who is right in contact with them, who says that his figures are always somewhat incomplete, but he gives the best information he can:

The general table of medical statistics is a consolidation of data from the various jurisdictions as tabulated from their annual reports. This table has to do principally with births and deaths and the incidence of the two main diseases, tuberculosis and trachoma. The first part of the table dealing with births and deaths shows a general birth rate for the Indian population throughout the country of 25.1 per thousand and a general death rate of 21.8, these being deaths from all causes.

The birth rate for the period covered by this report is the lowest for any year since 1911, the highest birth rate for any fiscal year during this period being 38.8 per thousand population for 1914. The birth rate has shown a gradual but fairly constant decline.

The death rate for the period 1911 to 1927, inclusive, has shown a downward trend, the rate for the fiscal year 1927 being the lowest with the exception of 1926, which was 18.2, and the same as 1923, when the death rate was 21.8. The highest death rate during the period 1911 to 1927, inclusive, was 35.6 for the year 1911. This excludes the fiscal year 1919, when the general death rate was influenced by deaths from influenza during the pandemic at this time.

As stated in a footnote at the bottom of this table, the births and deaths for a given agency are often not inclusive, but are only for those cases with which the Government officials have come in contact. There are still a considerable number of births and deaths which are not brought to the knowledge of agency officials, and deaths still occur in which there has been no medical attendance and the information has come to light too late to obtain informative data thereon. The figures are considered to be indicative of trends and have a distinct value with reference to the Indian population as a whole.

The death rate for 1927 is the lowest it has been any year since 1911, except the one mentioned, and this entirely contrary to the statement submitted by these organizations.

Now, in addition to this propaganda which creates suspicion of the Government in the minds of many who make many good people believe their Government is acting unworthily, whereas, as a matter of fact, it is acting most generously and worthily, in addition to that, there is an active interference with the work of the Government.

I remember last year we had paraded before us the story of a poor Indian up in Wisconsin who was manacled and chained. He had broken prison several times on the reservation and the superintendent chained him. His offense then was a most hideous one, the abuse of three Indian girls. He broke prison several times, and we were almost led to tears at his desperate strait because he was chained up there. The appeal was made that he ought to be tried in the courts of the State instead of before an Indian judge or a superintendent.

It is interesting to bring this little incident up to date. That Indian, Paul Moore, thereafter was party to a murder, when a druggist was killed by burglars at Ashland, Wis., was this time tried in the courts of the State, and is now serving a life sentence. There will be no more occasion to worry about his being manacled on an Indian reservation.

Another organization is the Mission Indian Federation of California. A man named Jonathan Tibbetts is the head of that

organization. It is in the records that up to 1922 he had collected \$80,000 from these pitifully poor Indians of California, leading them to think he was getting this money so as to be able to induce the Government to do them justice.

The net result is that he secured \$80,000 up to 1922, and I do not know how much since. He has organized "police" who are on the reservation, and the federation that appoints them states that their duties are "to preserve order on their respective reservations, to guard and protect the interests of the people."

The effrontery of a private organization to police a Government reservation and take over the functions of the Government! That could only culminate as it did last summer when, the officials of the Federal Government and the officials of the State and counties endeavoring to prevent some smuggling of liquor, armed interference by these unauthorized "police" resulted in the death of two or three Indians and the arrest of some of these police charged with the deaths, and they are now awaiting trial in the United States court. The hearings carry the full story.

You can see how much trouble it makes for those who have the responsibility of government among them to have such an organization thwart their efforts as I have indicated.

Sometimes you are given to understand that nearly all the money that the Government appropriates for the Indians is wasted in administration. What we spend there seems to be necessary. Each year the committee scrutinizes that, and each year we cut it down a little—what goes for administration and support. A little over \$13,000,000 is proposed in this bill out of the Treasury of the United States, and out of that there is for education \$7,297,000—over half of the total appropriation goes for education. That I can say, from a good deal of study of the question here and in the field, is being expended wisely and we are getting good results.

Now, the total number of children eligible for school attendance is 76,843. The number who are in Indian schools is 68,067. The number of eligible children not in school is 8,776. It is not strange that there should be several thousand children out of school, because of the conditions under which they live and their attitude in many cases as to school advantages, but we are reducing the number.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Has the gentleman any information as to the number that attend the public schools and the number that attend the Indian schools?

Mr. CRAMTON. In the Government schools we have 25,622. On the nonreservation boarding schools we have 9,616, on the reservation boarding schools 11,616, and at the day schools 4,390. Then there are the mission schools—contract boarding 2,030, noncontract boarding 2,327, and day schools 1,266. The number in the private schools is 35,124.

So the work of the Indian Bureau proceeds along safe and sane lines, with special emphasis upon three things: First, education; second, health; and, third, industrial assistance.

Mr. KNUTSON. In your hearings did you discover whether or not the tendency is to increase or to decrease the cost of the administration of Indians?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say this, to be explicit in answer to the gentleman without evasion: The appropriation for the Indian Bureau increases, due to the increased appropriations that go exclusively and directly for health and education. The cost of administration is less—administration of Indian property and administration of the bureau; it decreases, not rapidly, but it does decrease.

Mr. KNUTSON. I notice that the item for the Minnesota Chippewas is practically the same, although a small increase is made for roads.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Did the committee inquire of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs as to the proposal advanced by Secretary Work to transfer to the States for expenditure the money that is now being spent in education and health work among the Indians?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have never really seen the proposal of Secretary Work on that.

Mr. KNUTSON. You did not inquire about it?

Mr. CRAMTON. We did not go into it, but my inquiry and study of this subject for the last seven years has satisfied me that it would be folly to consider the decentralization of our health and educational work among the Indians. The States have a responsibility in handling their Indians, and if they fail to discharge their responsibility the result will be disastrous. The proposition is sometimes advanced that the United States should turn loose the Indians and their property. But see what happened in North Dakota, in one county up there,

the Turtle Mountain Band, the county has been obliged to spend \$12,000 a year for indigent Indians who are unrestricted and have been given their lands and have been turned loose. That is what would happen, and effort is being made to have us ration them generally if we turned them loose.

Now the policy of the Government is to utilize State schools wherever possible. Wherever there is a public school and they will admit the Indian children, we are ready to pay for their admission, wherever it is possible to turn the funds over and let the localities administer the schools. But to turn over all our Indian health work and educational work to the individual States would mean disorganization. In many cases it might result in the diversion of funds to purposes which the Federal Government did not contemplate. That has been illustrated by the diversion of funds in connection with the maternity act, now on the statute books, where the States, with money turned over to them for one purpose, have used it for different purposes.

I may say that something of this kind did come to my attention in connection with some resolutions the other day. While we want the States to do their share as to the health of the Indian—and I think the States in many respects have a financial responsibility—wherever possible we will cooperate, but to have the work turned over to the States entirely would destroy the organization.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman does not mean to say that the States are concerned when the Indians are still the wards of the Government and do not pay taxes and do not contribute to the support of the States?

Mr. CRAMTON. The States do not now limit their facilities for health and education to those who pay taxes. It is of the highest importance to the States that the Indian be made a useful member of society. I do not think the gentleman and I disagree as to that. The Federal Government has a responsibility which we perform generously, and I should say also that the States do have a responsibility. If the Indians should be turned loose and turned over to the States and own their property and their property made taxable, inside of three years those States would have a terrific burden placed upon them of maintaining people no longer wards of the Government and who would be no more fit to handle their property than they are now, and would soon be destitute and dependent.

#### PENSION BUREAU

The Bureau of Pensions bill before us carries materially less than last year. Just a word as to that. The expenditure under the appropriation for pensions for the fiscal year 1927 was \$230,000,000. The appropriation had been \$192,000,000, but because of new legislation affecting the Civil War and the Indian wars and the Spanish war the burden was increased. So instead of \$192,000,000, the real burden was \$230,000,000. There was an item in the deficiency bill last June, and because of the failure of that bill the Bureau of Pensions found that there was danger that they might not be able to pay the pensions for May and June. You can imagine the tragedy that would have happened in that case to old men and women, where it was so necessary for prompt payment. The Comptroller General was equal to the occasion; he cut the Gordian knot and gave a wrench to the law which I think everyone would approve of, because he adopted a construction that permitted every pensioner to get his pension when due.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I fully agree with what the gentleman says about what would have occurred if that order had not been made. Did the gentleman's committee investigate the 6, 8, and 12 months' delay at the present time in the Pension Bureau in handling the claims of Spanish War veterans? I have cases called to my attention where the men appeared before the examining board 6 or 8 or 10 months ago, and the decision of the commissioner has not yet been rendered, simply because the cases have not been reached. It is my understanding that the personnel of the Pension Bureau has not been increased, despite the fact that the Congress has time and again increased the work of the bureau by passing laws bringing in additional veterans under the general pension act.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the general burdens of the bureau are not so materially increased except for a period. The committee last year took the statement of the Commissioner of Pensions as to how many employees he would need under the policy of the department, and we gave him that number. Then the item went to the Senate, and the commissioner by that time thought it over and went before that body with a somewhat different showing from what he had made to us. That is not said in the way of criticism. He thought he had further information. I took some of the statements made

in that hearing and tried to follow them up, and I got possibly a third and a fourth explanation. I simply mention that to point out the difficulty that we have of getting exact and positive and concise information from that bureau. I know that they have stated to other Members of Congress, and they possibly have to my friend, that they could not act more promptly because of the lack of employees. I suggested in the course of our hearings the possibility of some survey of the bureau to determine the real facts, but that suggestion did not meet with enthusiasm. You will find that in the hearings we did discuss with them the number of employees that they want, and the commissioner urged that the policy then followed of not filling vacancies caused by retirement or death or resignation should not be followed further. From the statement made before us the amount recommended by the committee, which is the amount proposed by the Budget, is very substantially what the commissioner says that he will need for the next year. If my recollection serves me, his figure was perhaps \$10,000 more, on an item of something like \$1,000,000, as I remember. The difference between the figure recommended by the committee and the statement made by the commissioner, as I give it from recollection, is not sufficient to justify any material delay in handling the cases; and the gentleman must remember that when Congress puts more burden upon such a service, and possibly several thousand new claims are filed quickly, it is not feasible to immediately increase that organization so as to handle that great crush of new business without delay.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. At the same time, I do not feel that there should be a delay until the 1st of July in giving them the help they need to take care of the claims of Spanish War veterans, who are in need of financial assistance by reason of their disability at the present time, and whose examinations by the Pension Bureau physicians show that they are entitled to a pension under the act.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman please tell us where the Treasury found the money to meet these claims?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is what I was just about to come to. There was an appropriation of \$192,000,000 for 1927, and added responsibilities were \$38,000,000. The ruling of the comptroller, which you will find in the hearings, permitted the use of the 1928 appropriation for pensions, to pay the 1927 pensions. The only difference was, if they had been held over until the 1st of July, we would have had to pay them then, just the same out of the 1928 pensions. The only effect of his ruling was that these old men and women had their money when due, instead of waiting one or two months. There was the \$38,000,000 added responsibilities from 1927, and then the commissioner came before the deficiency appropriation committee last December and said that he needed \$8,000,000 more for 1928—\$46,000,000 of a deficiency this year, to take care of that burden brought over from another year and the increased burden for 1928. The total expenditures for 1927 amounts to \$230,000,000 and for 1928 it is now anticipated will be \$229,000,000. For 1929 the estimate of the Budget is \$210,000,000. There are so many things entering into this a year and a half in the future, through the death of pensioners and the presenting of new applications and their disposition that it can not be forecast absolutely. In our hearings the Commissioner of Pensions, on our insistence, expressed belief that about \$217,500,000 will be necessary instead of \$210,000,000, with a fluctuation between \$213,000,000 to \$220,000,000—something like that. My own judgment is that the \$210,000,000 is a little short of what will be our obligations.

This fund is a fund in the use of which the bureau has no discretion. It can not be used for anything except the payment of pensions, and for those who have been found entitled to the pension. Therefore, the committee recommended in this language the addition of the words "immediately available," with the idea that hereafter we shall carry that language each year. So that each year the difficulty that was faced last May, if there should be a deficiency, will not again occur and the appropriation of the following year may be used.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the committee made any provision for paying the expenses of contact officers from the Pension Bureau for the service they do in the different encampments?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. We have heard the gentlemen in touch with that question. We have concluded to give authority to the Secretary to allow them to attend the meetings.

#### RETIREMENT FUND

An important question coming under the bill under the Bureau of Pensions has to do with the retirement act. This bill carries for the first time \$19,950,000 to refund or pay the Federal contribution for going on with the retirement act.



If I may be permitted to make this statement without interruption, I shall be glad, and then if I can answer questions I shall be glad to do that. The subject is one that I think is complicated for most Members of the House; it certainly is for me. I think possibly, if I can make a continuous statement with the information I have been able to get, you will get a better idea about it than if I were interrupted. As to this matter of the obligation of the Government in connection with the civil-service retirement and disability fund, I do not think that there is anything in the bill that is more important. It is the beginning of a policy to provide for financing our obligations under the retirement law. There are many propositions to extend the responsibility of the Government with reference to retirement of civil-service employees. An editorial appeared in the Post this morning which commented on one, a very important proposition, it seems to me, by which the employees will pay less and get more and pay for a shorter period, and so forth, and thereby the Federal Government relieved entirely from any financial responsibility. Probably I do not fully understand the editorial, but that is the understanding I got from it. But we have many propositions to shorten the period before the employee can be retired. I can not feel any enthusiasm about that. I think there is no greater tragedy in life than when a man is interested in his work and reaches a period when he still can perform that work, to be told that he must retire.

That is a tragedy, and I hope I never get into a position where they will tell me I have got to quit. Of course, all Members of Congress face that possibility. The questions that naturally arise in connection with this item are—

Why should an appropriation be made at this time when there is already in the fund over \$68,000,000, and the fund is rapidly increasing from the contributions made by the employees? and,

If an appropriation is necessary, why is the amount to be appropriated fixed at \$19,950,000?

It is a sound principle of government that in times of peace the Government should pay its way as it goes. Our Government can not do this with respect to the civil-service retirement and disability fund unless it begins to appropriate at once. Pensions are merely deferred pay and should be provided for as they are earned.

If, when the retirement act took effect in 1920, (1) every one of the 400,000 and more employees had just entered the service, and (2) if the Government had exacted thereafter from each of those employees a contribution that would have been sufficient, with compound interest, to provide in full for his own retirement, if those two conditions had existed, then there would be no necessity now nor at any time in the future of appropriating a dollar. But the situation was entirely different.

It has been my impression that many Government employees have the impression that their contributions pay the full cost of what they are to get, and I think many Members of Congress have that understanding. However, I hope this may bring the matter to their attention in such a way as to largely disabuse their minds of that impression. The day the retirement act took effect about 7,000 employees were eligible for retirement who had not contributed a penny to the retirement fund and they, under the law, share just the same as if they had contributed during all the required period of the law.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Then the appropriations provided for by law take care of the accrued obligations—

Mr. CRAMTON (interposing). If the gentleman will permit I am sure I will get to that. There have been no appropriations by law heretofore. This is the first appropriation to meet the Government's obligation and that obligation of the Government comes from two sources: First, that those who were in the service when the act took effect, whether they retired one month after the act took effect or 50 years after it took effect, will get the rates provided in the law, regardless of their own contributions; and, second, that the rate provided in the law to pay the annuities provided in the law is insufficient to meet those annuities.

As I say, the day the retirement act took effect about 7,000 employees were eligible for retirement who had not contributed a penny to the retirement fund; and, in addition to these 7,000, there were also in the service about 400,000 employees with periods of service to their credit ranging all the way from one day to 50 or more years who had contributed nothing in the past and whose pensions could not be provided for in full by contributions during the remainder of their services.

In order to pay the pensions of those who retired at once without contributing anything, and those who were approaching retirement age, whose contributions would be insufficient, and to make up the deficiencies in the contributions of those who would retire in the future the act required (sec. 8, par. 1, act 1920) that the contributions of all employees should be placed

in a common fund which could be drawn upon immediately for pension payments.

It is obvious that this arrangement was merely a temporary expedient to provide the necessary capital to pay the pensions. It in no way relieved the Government of the necessity of making appropriations in the future. The act goes on to provide (sec. 11)—

that in the case an employee is separated from the service before retirement on annuity, the total amount of his deductions with interest shall \* \* \* be returned to him—

and (sec. 5, par. 4) that—

in all cases where the annuity is discontinued \* \* \* before the annuitant has received a sum equal to the total amount of his contributions with interest, the difference shall be paid to the employee or to his estate.

In other words, the law provides that the minimum that an employee shall receive in any event is the amount that he has paid, with compound interest thereon at 4 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied one hour.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is the minimum he can receive. If he resigns before his retirement age, then what he puts in is paid back to him; if he is retired and dies before he has received as much as he has contributed, plus the compound interest, his estate gets the balance. On the other hand, if he retires and lives a long period so that he exhausts an amount equal to his contribution, plus the compound interest, and then continues to draw money, somebody has got to pay that, and as no employee is to receive any less under any circumstances than he has contributed, plus the compound interest, naturally no one employee can be called upon to pay the annuity of another, and that leaves the Government to do the job.

It is obvious from these two provisions that not one penny of the deficiency in the contributions of one employee could be made up from the contributions of another employee, but that ultimately every penny taken from the fund to pay an employee a benefit which he had not provided for himself would sooner or later have to be returned to the fund out of the Treasury of the United States with compound interest at 4 per cent.

That this was recognized by the framers of the act may logically be inferred from the reports of the committees which accompanied the bills both in the House and the Senate, and the debates on the floors of both Houses, and also the provision carried in section 15 of the act which reads as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior shall submit annually to the Secretary of the Treasury estimates of appropriations necessary to continue this act in full force and effect.

Under this arrangement no estimate was ever submitted by the Secretary of the Interior until last year, and that estimate was not included in the Budget for the current year.

According to the records of the Bureau of Pensions more than \$40,000,000 had been paid out of the fund in annuities under this arrangement prior to July 1, 1927. The first year the annuity payments amounted, in round figures, to \$2,600,000; the second year to \$4,200,000; the third year to \$5,000,000; the fourth year to \$5,700,000; the fifth year to \$6,200,000; the sixth year to \$6,800,000; and the seventh year to \$9,600,000.

It will be seen that the annuity payments have increased every year since the act was passed, and I believe they will continue to increase for many years to come. The employees that went on pension in 1920 were the survivors of the active force of 30 years prior to that time; those who went on pension last year were likewise the survivors of the active force of 30 years ago. We may, therefore, fairly assume that the number of persons that will retire from year to year in the future will increase at about the same rate that the active force has increased from year to year in the past. This means that pension payments will probably increase within the next 10 years to a point where they will finally exceed the employees' net annual contributions; that is, after making deductions for refunds to those dying or withdrawing from the service. Such net annual contributions of employees now amount to approximately \$20,500,000 (\$24,358,882—\$3,862,288=\$20,496,594). When that time is reached the amount in the fund will begin to diminish rapidly and in the course of 10 years more the fund will be exhausted and thereafter the Government will have to provide each year the difference between the amount of the employees' net contributions and the total pension payments.

It is fair to assume that within the next 30 or 40 years the total pension payments and refunds will have increased to about \$40,000,000 a year.

The board of actuaries tell us that, according to the valuation which they made as of July 1, 1927, the obligation which the Government assumed when the retirement act became law in 1920, plus that which it has incurred between that date and July 1, 1927, amounts to \$393,000,000. This is generally referred to as the "accrued liability." This debt might be held indefinitely at its present amount by simply appropriating interest on it at 4 per cent, which would amount to \$15,720,000 a year. The pay roll of the employees covered under the act amounted on July 1, 1927, to \$798,000,000. This appropriation of \$15,720,000 amounts to 1.97 per cent of the pay roll. Therefore if the Government were to appropriate 1.97 per cent of the pay roll, the accrued liability could be held at its present amount of \$393,000,000. Such an appropriation would not, however, fully meet the obligation of the Government, for the contributions made by the employees at the rate of 3.5 per cent of their salaries have been found by actuarial determination to fall short of the amount required to pay the benefits by 0.48 of 1 per cent of the annual pay roll. Forty-eight hundredths of 1 per cent of the pay roll amounts to \$3,851,794. Therefore if the Government were to appropriate 2.45 (1.97+0.48) per cent of the pay roll, or \$19,572,729, it would hold the accrued liability at its present level and would provide its share of the accruing liability during the coming year.

When I say that to appropriate 2.45 per cent of the pay roll it will hold the accrued liability at its present amount and pay the Government's accruing liability, I mean provided the pay roll remains at its present level of \$798,000,000. If the pay roll increases beyond this amount the contribution corresponding to the increase would tend to liquidate some part of the liability of \$393,000,000.

In considering this question of the amount which the Government might properly appropriate for account of the retirement fund, the Budget Bureau decided to recommend an appropriation of an even 2.5 per cent of the pay roll, or a total of \$19,950,000. This would mean that the difference between 2.45 per cent and 2.50 per cent of the pay roll, or, roughly, \$400,000, the Government would apply to the liquidation of this accrued liability of \$393,000,000.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Will the gentleman please explain how the employees' contributions are invested by the Government?

Mr. CRAMTON. I had hoped to cover that, but I do not have that information fully at hand. However, it is in the buying of bonds which are set aside in a separate fund and on which interest is paid. I think they are Government bonds.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I think they are largely farm-loan bonds.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Will the gentleman tell us what the average yield is?

Mr. CRAMTON. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury gives information as to the various retirement funds. The gentleman will understand that there are other retirement funds in operation—the State Department, the Army, the Navy, and so forth. On pages 136 and 137 of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the year ending June 30, 1927, is a statement with reference to this, and I will insert at this point the tabulation which appears on page 136:

Assets:	Principal cost
\$22,695,050 face amount fourth Liberty loan 4½ per cent bonds—	\$22,399,454.01
31,200,000 face amount 4 per cent special Treasury notes, payable June 30, 1931—	31,200,000.00
14,400,000 face amount 4 per cent special Treasury notes, payable June 30, 1932—	14,400,000.00
	\$67,999,454.01
68,295,050	
Unexpended balances June 30, 1927—	424,831.17
Total fund assets—	68,424,285.18

Mr. BRIGHAM. It is probable that some of the securities are actually earning in excess of 4 per cent.

Mr. CRAMTON. Probably some of them do. I think the gentleman will find that section of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of interest.

The question may be asked, How many years will the Government be required to appropriate this \$19,950,000? Fifteen million seven hundred and twenty thousand dollars of that amount is interest on the accrued liabilities of \$393,000,000. The length of time that the Government will have to appropriate the interest on this amount will depend entirely upon the

rapidity with which the debt is liquidated. If it is not liquidated at all, the Government will have to appropriate it in perpetuity.

The question is whether the Government shall begin now to meet its obligations to the retirement fund as they are incurred from year to year, pay the interest on the accrued liabilities of \$393,000,000, and create a small sinking fund starting with approximately one-half million dollars a year, or shall it allow its obligations to the fund to remain unpaid and to accumulate at compound interest until ultimately it will be called upon to appropriate about \$40,000,000 a year. If it begins to appropriate 2.5 per cent of the pay roll now, the Government will be meeting its entire accruing liability from year to year and will be gradually liquidating the debt of \$393,000,000 which it originally assumed. When this original liability has been wiped out, the Government's contributions will be reduced to less than one-half of 1 per cent of the pay roll, or approximately \$4,000,000 a year. This amount is what is referred to in the report of the board of actuaries as "the Government's normal contributions," and is stated as forty-eight one-hundredths of 1 per cent of the pay roll.

The question therefore comes down to a practical one of whether the Government shall adopt a program involving an annual contribution of 2.5 per cent of the pay roll or approximately \$20,000,000 a year, which will ultimately be reduced to forty-eight one-hundredths of 1 per cent of the pay roll, or approximately \$4,000,000 a year; or shall it postpone appropriations for 20 years until the fund is exhausted and then be required to provide increasing amounts annually until in 40 years from now it must appropriate nearly \$40,000,000 a year in perpetuity.

At that time the fund will be exhausted and the Government will owe the employees, in round figures, \$875,000,000 on account of money borrowed from the fund to pay pensions. The pensions will then amount to about \$35,000,000 and refunds to \$32,000,000, making a total annual expenditure of \$67,000,000. This expenditure will be met by the interest of \$35,000,000 on the floating debt of \$875,000,000, plus the Government's normal contribution of \$4,000,000, represented by forty-eight one-hundredths of 1 per cent of the pay roll, plus the employees' contributions of \$28,000,000. The fund will then stand as follows:

Income:	
Interest at 4 per cent on the floating debt of \$875,000,000 to employees—	\$35,000,000
Normal contributions by the Government of forty-eight one-hundredths of 1 per cent of pay roll—	4,000,000
Contributions by employees of 3.5 per cent of pay roll—	28,000,000
Total—	67,000,000
Expenditures:	
Pensions—	35,000,000
Refunds—	32,000,000
Total—	67,000,000

At that time the Government will, in fact, be paying the entire cost of the pensions and in addition the excess of refunds over the contributions amounting to about \$4,000,000 a year, and to that extent will be worse off than if no contributions were exacted from the employees. This situation would be the direct outcome of the Government's failure to meet its current obligations for pensions at the time the obligations are incurred.

In the hearings you will find quite a presentation of this matter and quite a showing of what was in the minds of various ones connected with the legislation at the time it passed Congress in 1920 and in 1926. I will only quote this extract from the report of the Committee on the Civil Service, which I think was presented by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. LEHLBACH. This report accompanied the bills which became law July 3, 1926, and in that report it is said:

Generally the sum contributed by the employee is less than the cost of the annuity, and the difference is paid by the Government.

The resources of the fund comprise the contributions of the employees with their interest accumulations and such appropriations as the Government must needs make to meet the liabilities, comprised of annuity payments and refunds.

While contributions to the retirement fund have only been made since August, 1920, the benefits of retirement were made fully available to all employees within the system at that time. Those who were immediately retired when the law came into operation had contributed nothing toward their annuity and consequently the proportion of contribution by the Government to meet the cost of the annuity was 100 per cent. With each year the proportion the Government must pay will diminish, but will not completely reach the normal cost while there exists annuitants who were in the service prior to August, 1920.



On the other hand, a policy that ignores all Government liability and continues to meet all obligations of the fund out of the contributions of the employees and their earnings will have this result. Eventually the outgo will exceed the income and the cash balance in the fund will be gone. Thereafter it will be incumbent on the Government to appropriate annually to pay all annuities and to return all refunds with accumulated interest, less only the contributions for that year. To saddle upon future generations such an unwarranted expenditure is unconscionable.

Hence, I take it, the recommendation of the Budget and of the committee will have the indorsement of the gentleman from New Jersey, who was chairman of the committee which legislated on this question.

Mr. LEHLBACH. It most emphatically has.

Mr. CRAMTON. And I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey knows a great deal more about this subject than I can ever hope to know.

Have I reached the points the gentleman from Illinois had in mind?

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. I think the gentleman has answered the question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I must not trespass much more on the time of the committee. I will just touch on one or two other features of the bill in a briefer fashion.

Mr. MURPHY. May I refresh the gentleman's memory at this point for the sake of making the record complete?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. I think the facts brought out on page 756 of the hearings, when the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] asked Mr. McCoy some questions, should appear here:

Mr. FRENCH. Let us put into the record at this point a statement that will show the total deficit as of June 30, 1927.

Mr. McCoy. \$440,558,433 would be the appropriation required by the Government as of June 30, 1927, to balance the total liabilities.

Mr. TAYLOR. Assuming that there is a legal liability under the law?

Mr. McCoy. Well, we will leave the Government out. That is the amount necessary to balance the liability.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, according to the figures of Mr. McCoy, on June 30, 1927, the Government owed \$440,558,433 to this retirement fund.

Mr. CRAMTON. And this appropriation is the first step toward meeting the obligations of the Government.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Four hundred and forty million dollars is not actually owed to the retirement fund on June 30, 1927, or any other time. Four hundred and forty million dollars is the present value of the payments to be made by the Government from August 22, 1920, until the last person who was in the employ of the Government in 1920 shall have died; that is, it is what it will owe over a course of possibly 40 or 50 years. It is the present value of what they will owe for half a century.

Mr. CRAMTON. Manifestly, that must be so.

Mr. MURPHY. The Government is doing the same thing with respect to this \$440,000,000 that any great life insurance company would be required to do.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is an obligation which, when it accrues, will amount to that. Of course, if it were not as the gentleman from New Jersey has said, then this appropriation we have would not suffice to meet it in any appreciable degree. Of course, as soon as we make this appropriation it begins to bear the compounding of interest, and so forth.

#### RECLAMATION SERVICE

As to the reclamation fund carried in this bill, there is an appropriation of \$12,614,000.

I will put in the Record a statement of the resources of that fund and from what the income is expected to be derived. I will not take your time now further than to say that they anticipate they will have on hand at the beginning of this next fiscal year \$15,229,700, and an appropriation of \$12,614,000 is as close to the amount that it is expected the fund will have available as we ought to go when we remember that the moneys are somewhat problematical as to returns.

Estimate of reclamation funds available, fiscal year 1929

Item	Actual			Estimated	
	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929
Sale of public lands and town lots.....	\$761, 580	\$510, 000	\$596, 200	\$700, 000	\$700, 000
Mineral leasing act.....	4, 820, 610	4, 448, 400	3, 504, 700	3, 150, 000	3, 150, 000
Potassium royalties.....	5, 220	5, 800	3, 600	5, 000	5, 000
Federal power licenses.....	5, 840	7, 700	13, 000	11, 000	16, 300
Subtotal, new money.....	5, 593, 250	4, 972, 500	4, 117, 500	3, 866, 000	3, 871, 300
Construction repayments and funds advanced.....	4, 245, 440	3, 438, 400	2, 131, 000	3, 300, 000	3, 300, 000
Operation and maintenance repayments.....	1, 007, 910	1, 734, 300	2, 264, 400	1, 700, 000	4, 700, 000
Miscellaneous collections, including power, grazing lands, etc.....	1, 299, 140	1, 428, 000	1, 167, 200	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000
Subtotal, repayments.....	7, 152, 490	6, 600, 700	5, 563, 200	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000
Total receipts.....	12, 745, 740	11, 573, 200	9, 680, 700	9, 866, 000	9, 871, 300
Cash on hand beginning of fiscal year.....	5, 471, 650	6, 575, 100	8, 244, 800	9, 492, 400	5, 358, 400
Total available.....	18, 217, 390	18, 148, 300	17, 925, 500	19, 358, 400	15, 229, 700

There is one thing in connection with this that I would like to call to the attention of the committee, and that is the proposed expansion of the Reclamation Service, to the South particularly, using appropriations out of the Federal Treasury. The reclamation fund, as operated in the West, in the public-land States, is operated out of money received in that fund from the public resources of those States. In other words, the reclamation has been carried on largely by money derived from sale of oil and minerals and public lands in the public-land States.

Now, we are about to meet a proposition to extend the work of reclamation in the Southern States to what is called cut-over lands and swamp lands.

In the discussions the matter has been broad enough to cover my State; in fact, there is an organization, the National Drainage League, or something of the kind, that is circularizing the country and wrote to the county drainage commissioner of one county in my district, a prosperous county where they spend thousands and thousands of money for drains. This National Drainage Association sent a circular to that county drainage commissioner—as it probably has to thousands of others—leading him to believe they had under way a program that would relieve the county of Huron, in the State of Michigan, from further expenditures for drainage and let the Federal Government take it over.

Of course, the program that actually will be presented to us will not be as far-reaching as that. Such a program would fall

of its own weight; but the program is in certain States that have been most active in it—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, all of the States that are developed and have quite abundant resources—that in these States the Reclamation Service shall enter on a work of development, as set forth in the following resolutions set forth in the recent conference in Washington:

Whereas reclamation as now defined is a movement for better homes in directed country life centers for diversified farming, for education based upon the natural endowments of our people, for full use of all modern transportation and market facilities, and for the fullest application of available scientific knowledge.

Whereas successful demonstration of such a program is essential to our economic, social, and political life; and

Whereas the opportunities and needs of the South make it an appropriate field for these demonstrations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend as the general plan of development that approved by the Chief of the Bureau of Reclamation, which is based upon the report to the Secretary of the Interior, of an able and impartial advisory committee appointed by him, and further upon the detailed reports of the bureau experts made as the result of recent surveys authorized by Congress.

Second. That the Congress be asked to pass at this session such legislation as will authorize the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior to carry out this program as rapidly as practicable.

Third. That an appropriation of \$14,000,000 be requested, of which \$2,000,000 shall be available for one project in each of the following States: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, in which States expert investigation already has been made; the exact amounts required and used to be determined within these limits by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Sufficient data has been gathered in South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, and Tennessee to enable plans and estimates of reclamation and farm development to be made and to forecast what benefits could be anticipated from such development.

In North Carolina, Florida, and Alabama these investigations have not been completed. The appropriation of \$15,000 requested will be sufficient to accomplish this result and complete a final report on the work in all seven States. No further appropriations for investigations of this character seem to be necessary unless some constructive action is decided upon and legislation fixing the extent of the Federal Government's participation is enacted by Congress.

At a conference held in Washington December 14 and 15 this view was explained and a plan of future action outlined which contemplated the creation from private sources of a fund for financing certain features of the development and legislation by Congress to provide for planning and supervision only. The conference did not approve of this plan, but decided to ask Congress to finance this development.

The recommendation of the department has been that the Federal Government should not do more than give its services, and that the expenditures should come from the States and communities. But those resolutions urge that the total appropriation should come from the Federal Treasury. I do not know what the doctrine of State rights will come to in some sections of the country unless the desire for spending Federal funds is lessened in some way. I believe it is a serious matter—this desire to have the Government enter on a large improvement program out of the Federal Treasury in communities that are organized and have resources and that I believe can more economically and wisely handle their own problems. It was different in the West in the case of Nevada, Wyoming, and New Mexico, where there was a large amount of public land and the Federal Government felt that it was responsible for developing its own land. In cases like Alabama, Tennessee, and Georgia they have their own resources, their own organization in communities where they can very well carry on the work themselves.

Mr. WINTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. WINTER. It should also be noted that in cases of the West in these large areas there was only 5 or 8 per cent of agricultural land and the balance was nonagricultural.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is true. Now, the proposed legislation provides that the money shall be returned to the Government in 28 years with interest. We started the reclamation projects with the statement that the money was to come back in 10 years without interest; without interest because they always urged that it was their money and resources, and it was urged that 90 per cent would be used on public lands and come back in 10 years. That was extended to 20 years, and now it is 40 years without interest. This proposition says that the money will come back in 28 years. I wonder if we came back 20 years from now what the thing would be like; that is, if it once is started. As to the Geological Survey there is an apparent decrease in the appropriation, but an actual increase, due to an item the committee have recommended exceeding the Budget figure by \$50,000 on the work of gauging streams in order that we may cooperate more fully with the States.

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

As to construction of roads in the national parks, the bill appropriates two and one-half million dollars, of which a million and a half dollars is to pay prior obligations, some for new work.

The Budget recommended authority to contract obligations to the amount of a million and a half dollars, but the committee have recommended authority to contract additional obligations to the extent of \$4,000,000 based upon this theory: First, that the increased attendance in the national parks, the increase of automobile travel in them is such as to make imperative the construction of additional roads and a more rapid development of roads than we have had heretofore. For instance, in the Yosemite Park the attendance was 490,000 for the year ending October 1 last, nearly treble the attendance two or three years ago, and in the other parks there is also an increase, though not as rapid, but on the whole 20 per cent per annum.

The roads program does not mean that the full \$4,000,000 would come into the fiscal year of 1929; it means that there would be appropriated next December perhaps \$2,500,000, certainly not more, if we adopt this authorization. Our purpose is to go along on a program of \$5,000,000 a year. Further, this

authorization will save money. For instance, if the road to be constructed is a job that takes more than one year, as the Mount Carmel Road in the Mount Zion Park, Utah—this year they contracted \$605,000 for part of the road. Next year they will let the contract for the other portion of it. The contractor who is in there with his equipment will have an advantage over others when the next contract is let, which he will keep for himself rather than give to the Government.

If we had let the contract for the full million dollars' worth of work to be done in two years, then the Government would have gotten the advantage of that, and whoever bid would have known that in turning in their equipment and their organization, they would have had two years' work before them.

Some day I would like to talk to the House about the situation with reference to roads in the Yosemite National Park and the failure of the city of San Francisco to perform its obligations under the Hetch Hetchy act that passed years ago. But I am not going to take the time to do that now, but will do it at some future time when I have not tired you as much as I have to-day.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman leaves the national parks, I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Is the appropriation for roads and trails throughout the national parks which was allowed this year, sufficient to take care of the program that the park service has in mind for the year 1928, or approximately that?

Mr. CRAMTON. For the year 1928?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. For the actual construction they intend to undertake in 1928.

Mr. CRAMTON. This bill is to provide for next year, although it is true that the funds are made immediately available to be used for the construction season of 1928.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That is my understanding of it, from the language of the bill. What I am trying to get at is whether or not the amount actually appropriated for roads and trails throughout the national parks will be sufficient to carry out the program outlined by the park service.

Mr. CRAMTON. Here is the situation: \$50,000,000 worth of roads are to be built. I do not say they are all going to be built out of this appropriation or that it is all that the park service would like to build this year, but this amount will cover the proposed \$5,000,000 program which I think the gentleman has in mind.

#### EDUCATION OF NATIVES OF ALASKA

The \$26,500 for the Bureau of Education in Alaska is due to the feeling of the committee that we have an obligation there to perform in extending the work among the natives of Alaska. I think I speak for the members of the committee when I say that. I know of the interest which the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] has shown particularly, and I think probably we would like to go further than we have in this bill. The \$26,500 permits a school to be established at Kanakanak, where the canneries are donating the building, and we provide the equipment and maintenance. Then there is \$9,000 for a school at Egegik, which is a most desolate place along the shores, the item being brought to our attention by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and we are satisfied that it is highly important that it should be established. Back of this is this situation: Several years ago it had been the policy to bring the children from Alaska to the Indian school at Chemawa, Oreg., for education. We stopped that policy several years ago, and each year there is a provision in the bill which prevents it. That is for two reasons. In the first place, Chemawa is needed for the Indian children of this country, and secondly we felt that the natives of Alaska were not getting the training that they should have away from their own environment. So, several years ago, we started in to build up the industrial schools among the natives of Alaska, and, as a matter of fact, that work ought to progress more rapidly than it has. The budget before us had nothing for new construction and expansion. We have only provided those two schools. We would like to provide more for industrial training. Personally, I think we ought to expend from \$50,000 to \$100,000 each year, spreading that work up there.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. I would ask in respect about the period over which this industrial education has extended.

Mr. CRAMTON. I should say four or five years.

Mr. FRENCH. Since that policy has been inaugurated.

Mr. CRAMTON. And the gentleman will find that it is bringing in very good results. There are very good reports upon it. The gentleman understands how the natives of Alaska are. They are on the shore, scattered in that immense line up, say,



into the Arctic regions, remote from everything, and their old-time industry of fishing is disappearing. We think this work is being carried on in a practical way.

Mr. HUDSON. To really reach them there must be a number of schools rather than to try and gather them into large schools.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. FRENCH. Probably the chairman of the committee should say that we are caring for some 4,000 children, but those children mostly are in the lower grades, and the ones to which the chairman has referred now are for the most part more advanced pupils, where we are trying to care for them in three industrial schools.

Mr. HUDSON. I would apprehend that the chairman of the committee means that the industrial work would have to apply to the higher grades.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. The other education, as Mr. FRENCH suggests, has been going on for a long time. I am sure that my colleague from Michigan will be much interested in the facts brought out by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], who is very much interested in this work in connection with Alaska.

#### PROSPECTORS IN MCKINLEY NATIONAL PARK

I want now to call the attention of the House to the McKinley National Park, which is a wonderful reservation for game and a wonderful scenic area. When the law passed it contained authority to prospect for minerals in the park area. I suppose that was necessary in order to get the legislation through. At the present time I am advised that there is no active prospecting for minerals in the park area. There is one area that has been somewhat developed, the Copper River, or some such name. There was joined with that privilege of prospecting in the park area the privilege to the prospector of killing game for food, not to be taken out of the park.

Now, of course, anybody that you find in the park now killing game is a "prospector," and he was killing it for food. In the first place, if it is to be a national park it should be preserved without mining operations other than those heretofore authorized. I think the prospecting privilege should be eliminated; certainly with the building of the railroad and the development of other roads and the availability of other food supplies. If we are not willing to drop out prospecting, we should withdraw the right of prospectors to kill game in that wonderful domain. At present the game is frightened by hunters, and the visitors to the park lose the pleasure they would otherwise have in seeing the wild life in its natural state.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,  
Washington, January 5, 1928.

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR Mr. CRAMTON: I have your letter of January 3 in regard to the law and the regulations pertaining to prospecting and killing of game in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska. Following are extracts from the organic law establishing the park and rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior. The act of February 26, 1917 (39 Stat. 939, U. S. C. p. 410, sec. 352), provides that—

"The said park is established as a game refuge, and no person shall kill any game in said park except under an order from the Secretary of the Interior for the protection of persons or to protect or prevent the extermination of other animals or birds. Prospectors and miners engaged in prospecting or mining in said park may take and kill therein so much game or birds as may be needed for their actual necessities when short of food; but in no case shall animals or birds be killed in said park for sale or removal therefrom, or wantonly."

Under authority of the above law the Secretary of the Interior promulgated the following regulations in regard to hunting in the park:

"The park is a sanctuary for wild life of every sort, and hunting, killing, wounding, or capturing any bird or wild animal in the park, except dangerous animals when it is necessary to prevent them from destroying life or inflicting injury, is prohibited."

"Prospectors and miners actually engaged in prospecting or mining within the limits of the park may kill park game or birds needed for their actual necessities when short of food; but in no case shall animals or birds be killed in the park for sale or for removal therefrom or wantonly. Each prospector or miner killing animals or birds under these regulations must keep a detailed record in writing of animals and birds killed, open to the inspection of the superintendent, which shall at the first opportunity be sent to the superintendent after the prospecting or mining is ended. No animals shall be killed within the park limits primarily for the purpose of dog food, except with the prior permission in writing from the superintendent, but when animals are killed for food by prospectors or miners the excess portions may be fed dogs without such prior permission."

"The outfits, including guns, traps, horses, or means of transportation used by persons illegally engaged in hunting, killing, trapping, and snaring or capturing birds or wild animals, or in possession of game

killed on the park lands under circumstances other than prescribed above shall be taken up by the superintendent and held subject to the order of the Director of the National Park Service. Firearms, carried by others than legitimate miners and prospectors, are prohibited in the park except on written permission of the superintendent."

With regard to the rights of prospectors within the park the following is an excerpt from the act of establishment, section 4, "Nothing in this act shall in any way modify or affect the mineral land laws applicable to the lands in the said park." In other words these lands were not withdrawn from location for the purposes of prospecting for minerals within the boundaries of the said park. By the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), it is provided that—

"All valuable mineral deposits in lands belonging to the United States, both surveyed and unsurveyed, shall be free and open to exploration and purchase, and the lands in which they are found to occupation and purchase, by citizens of the United States and those who have declared their intention to become such, under regulations prescribed by law, and according to the local customs or rules of miners in the several mining districts, so far as the same are applicable and not inconsistent with the laws of the United States."

Under this law all citizens of the United States have the right to enter the park lands for the purposes of prospecting for mineral deposits. Prospecting permits for coal, phosphate, sodium, oil, oil shale, or gas are not obtainable in Mount McKinley.

The following is an extract from the superintendent's monthly report for the month of February, 1927:

"From a general observation made during last month, Chief Ranger Nyberg states he is fully convinced that the trappers, plying their profession outside the park boundaries, have increased at least 100 per cent over last year's quota. The rehabilitation of the park's wild life and its subsequent overflow to the neighboring localities is without doubt the cause of this, and incidentally proves that which has always been contended that leave the park animals alone and by unrestricted breeding their number will increase so as to force them to turn to those sections of the country outside the park boundaries. Here they would be offered a less crowded domain and possible larger feeding grounds, and would there be the legitimate prey and prize of the hunters and trappers."

It may also be said that even though the park has not suffered from the molestations of trappers as of yore, still there is room for a vast improvement in the attitude of the majority of prospectors in and adjoining the park area.

Nothing stated in the above paragraphs must be construed that there is now small warrant for additional rangers. The demand for an increased personnel is greater than ever.

The following is an extract from the superintendent's monthly report for the month of May, 1927:

"A rather good illustration of the character of one of the so-called prospectors operating within the confines of the park may be gained from a sketch of events occurring lately. Though the exact dates are lacking, the information is authentic and can be corroborated at any time."

"During the past month a Mr. Carlson, prospecting in the park and trapping in its environs, was arrested by the Territorial game warden for trapping beaver out of season. At the same time he had shot a white-skinned cow moose and had endeavored to sell the hide as a novelty. For this latter act he was also indicted for two counts under the Alaskan game law for killing out of season and the shooting of a female, which is prohibited. Upon his trial he was found guilty on six counts, and costs aggregating \$1,000, and his pelts confiscated. He had also been in the habit of using from 9 to 12 dogs in his team and was ordered by the game commission to use only five hereafter. The reason for this was the commission concluded that a man of his caliber did not require that many dogs and that such a large team was a bad drain on the wild animal life (which he no doubt killed for dog feed)."

"This type of 'prospector' is not wanted in the country, as his operations are detrimental to the wild life and also to the morale of others (though remunerative to the Territorial treasury). It is to be hoped that restrictions may be placed on such individuals while prospecting within the park."

"It may also be said in this case that Superintendent Karstens had visited this man's 'prospecting cabin' in the park about two years ago and therein found stretching boards (for fur), moose horns, and other evidences of illegal hunting and trapping. Chief Ranger Nyberg also kicked up a trap line in 1925, which it was conclusively found to belong to the same Mr. Carlson."

I trust this information is that which you desired.

Sincerely yours,

ARNO B. CAMMERER, Acting Director.

I want to call attention to the fact that the operation deficit of the Alaskan Railroad dropped below \$900,000 during the year. It is the first year that it has been below \$1,000,000. The operating deficit of the Alaskan Railroad for 1929 is practically one-half what it was in 1925. Quite a lot of expenditures

are being carried on for betterments that will further reduce the operating cost. Those betterments are of a permanent character.

#### FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

The only other thing that I desire to mention is the item with reference to Freedmen's Hospital, the last item in the bill. That is an institution that almost exclusively cares for the colored people. It was established by the Federal Government, and has been maintained exclusively by the Federal Government for many years, except occasionally when new construction was necessary. The District government in former years has paid partly for that new construction, but that has been rather an exception to the rule. It is a local institution, and it is the one hospital in the District of Columbia where the colored people generally are sent. There are a few exceptions. Sometimes they are sent to Gallinger. But generally they are sent now to Freedmen's Hospital. Colored patients, with their residence somewhere outside, are occasionally sent to this hospital, but the patients in most cases are resident somewhere in the District of Columbia. Of course, in a city like Detroit when a colored person is taken ill he is taken to a hospital, and every city has the duty of taking care of the stranger within its gates. He may not have a voting residence in Detroit, but if he is in Detroit and is taken ill, Detroit cares for him, just as the city of Chicago would take care of him if he were taken ill in Chicago and had a residence in Detroit. It is not to be believed that of the colored people of the Nation a great number come to Washington for the express purpose of getting treatment in this Freedmen's Hospital. They check up on them as nearly as they can, and establish a place of residence for them outside the District wherever possible, so that the figures they tabulate for us in the hearings may be deemed conservative as to the responsibility of the District. There were 938 patients who are shown to be residents pure and simple of the District out of about 2,800 indigent patients. Those are the ones for whom they could not find any excuse for charging up to the States. Then there is about the same number from Maryland and Virginia. Those are adjacent sections, in most instances just over the boundary line. There were 487 from Virginia and 490 from Maryland. Two thousand then live in the District of Columbia and just over the line, probably. In addition, there are about 19,000 ambulatory cases that the superintendent says are entirely District people.

The District has not provided any institution for the colored. They take some of them into Gallinger, but send most of them to the Freedmen's Hospital. They have been paying a per capita contract price for their indigent, but that does not include any of the overhead of the hospital or the new buildings, and so forth.

Frankly, a good deal may be said in favor of turning the institution over to the District so that they might have a hospital of their own, but the colored people have come to look upon it as being intended for them, and they prefer it as a Federal institution. The staff of the hospital—Superintendent Warfield and his excellent staff—now have a civil-service status which they would lose if they were turned over to the District. We felt that this was almost exclusively a District institution.

Mr. BERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BERGER. Is the staff made up of colored people?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think it is, entirely.

Mr. FRENCH. I believe so, entirely.

Mr. HUDSON. Does it have any connection with Howard University and its school of medicine, and so forth?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; except that a hospital and a school of medicine need an affiliation. The medical school of the university maintains a connection with the hospital. Both institutions acquire a benefit from that arrangement. But whether it was a Federal or a District institution, both Howard University and the Freedmen's Hospital would find it advantageous to continue that arrangement.

While we felt that this was almost exclusively a proper District responsibility, we felt also that we should be generous and so we are only asking that the District pay half of the cost of maintenance and half of the cost of the buildings, which we are satisfied are urgently needed. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], of our subcommittee, went through the institution very carefully and commended very highly to the committee the value of the work done there, and also emphasized the need of the buildings here provided.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan has been compromising, has he, upon the so-called Cramton proposition?

Mr. CRAMTON. Not yet.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, he has on this particular case gone back to the 50-50 proposition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Not at all.

Mr. BLANTON. I notice in the press that a very distinguished Senator whom I happen to know owns much property out in the silk-stocking neighborhood of Washington—

Mr. CRAMTON. I am sure the gentleman from Texas does not—

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman interrupts me. This particular Senator with his property, part of which forms a new addition out there that is becoming valuable, and should be taxed—he has come out for the 50-50 proposition.

The press is making a drive now, as it annually does, led by Mr. Theodore Noyes, who partly owns the Associated Press of the United States. He partly owns it, does he not? I will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin whether he does not partly own it?

Mr. BERGER. May I answer the gentleman?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know whose speech this is, but it is being improved right along.

Mr. BERGER. He does not own anything except his share in the Star.

Mr. BLANTON. I said partly.

Mr. BERGER. His share in the Star.

Mr. BLANTON. But he helps to conduct it because he is a high official of it. He is making a drive against the people of the United States for the pernicious 50-50 plan or at least the so-called 60-40 plan. Now, is the gentleman from Michigan going to stand hitched on the proposition? That is what I would like to know, because I have been fighting under his banner here and I have been trying to uphold his hands.

Mr. CRAMTON. I want to be sure of the gentleman's continued support. If the gentleman from Texas will be so kind as to continue his confidence in me and give me his support, he can be sure there will be no change in the system affecting the fiscal relations between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, if I can help it.

Mr. BLANTON. May I say to my friend from Michigan, and to my colleagues, that there has been no man in the House fairer to the people of the District than the gentleman from Michigan. He has been as fair as he could be. The answer to all of this fuss in the newspapers is that the tax rate here in the District to-day is \$1.70 on the hundred, which is all the tax they pay.

Mr. CRAMTON. One dollar and eighty cents.

Mr. BLANTON. One dollar and seventy cents for this tax year. That has been voted. I keep up a little closer than my friend does. It is \$1.70 for this year. That is all the tax they pay, and on a 50 per cent assessment, if you please.

I can show you property after property, valuable property in the District, assessed at 50 per cent valuation, and, as I say, the rate is only \$1.70. There is not another comparable city in the United States whose people pay as little tax as do the people in the District of Columbia. The people here ought to be ashamed of themselves for continually hounding the gentleman from Michigan because he wants to be fair both to them and to the rest of the people of the United States.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman from Texas gives me credit, which, I am frank to say, has not always been accorded me, for being fair with the District. I am reminded of the man who was looking for a job. When he asked what pay he would get he was told they would pay him what he was worth, and he said he could not afford to work for that. So, in the District it is not enough to be fair with them. They can not afford that.

The last time the gentleman interrogated me on the floor on this plan I drew a very scathing editorial in a local newspaper, and so it was with some misgivings that I yielded again to-day, but perhaps I shall become accimated to that. The gentleman has said something about the half-and-half plan with regard to the item that is before us. In what I do in the House I try to be practical and try to avoid setting my stake at a point that I can not come up to. I try to accomplish results, and that has been true in my efforts with reference to the District. What I am trying to do now with regard to this one item seemed to be the thing that could be done and is certainly fully fair to the District. Half of that is what we are assuming for the time being as our Federal responsibility and the other half is the responsibility of the District itself. That half is to be paid as other expenses of the District are paid. The present lump-sum system means that they pay the full amount. If we should



return to the 60-40 plan we would have 40 per cent of that other half to pay. However, I have no idea whatever that we will return to the 60-40 plan.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. How does the Freedmen's Hospital compare with other hospitals in the city with reference to the skill of the staff and the treatment given?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will ask my friend from Idaho, who made the investigation of the institution, to answer that, if he cares to.

Mr. FRENCH. I am not a professional man. I think that question is one that I can not answer with any amount of information back of it. I understand, however, as the chairman has stated, that Doctor Warfield is held in high regard and that he is supported by a very able corps of assistants, which includes the nurse corps as well as the medical corps.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I hope, when I get this bill off my hands and have a little relaxation, that one of my diversions will be to make some statement to the House on the subject he has brought up.

Mr. BLANTON. I am simply glad to know the gentleman has not compromised. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, I sometimes compromise when I have to, but not otherwise.

There is only one further thought and then I am through. In connection with what my colleague has said, I have felt personally it would be desirable for the institution to have it turned over to the District. It has not seemed wise to do so, for the reason I suggested, but I have thought if it were a District institution then it would be alongside of Gallinger and Congress would expect the District would give to Freedmen equipment equal to Gallinger. It would seem that the same authority should be supervising these different institutions, but that is quite apart from the present bill.

I thank the committee very much for its patience. [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, we have under consideration the Interior Department appropriation bill. As its name indicates, it appropriates for all of the bureaus under the supervision of the Interior Department.

This bill, in my judgment, affords a broader opportunity for a study of the internal affairs of our country, perhaps, than any other bill coming before Congress for consideration.

It is a bill that affects more people throughout the entire country and more people are therefore interested in it than any other appropriation bill that will come before Congress. Being a new member on the Committee on Appropriations, I want to confess the very modest part I have played in the preparation of this bill. It is a great pleasure for me to be associated with the other four members of the subcommittee who have performed a great service in the preparation of this bill. All four of my associates on the committee have seen long service in the House, and have been members of this particular subcommittee for a number of years, and they are therefore very familiar with many, if not all, of the details which came up for consideration in the preparation of this measure. I want particularly to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for his judicial temperament, for his fairness, for his thorough knowledge of the various bureaus appropriated for, and for his uniform courtesy and painstaking care which he has exercised in the preparation of every item in this bill.

The other members of the committee, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] have each been diligent in the performance of their duties, and have rendered efficient service in cooperation with the chairman.

In connection with the consideration of this bill I want to invite attention, in an effort to correct an erroneous impression, particularly with the new Members, as well as some of the older Members of the House, and the people throughout the country generally, how this and other appropriation bills are prepared and recommended to the House for consideration.

This bill carries a total amount recommended for appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, of \$272,430,789. Estimates were prepared by the Bureau of the Budget in advance and submitted to the committee for consideration, recommending appropriations for the various bureaus of \$273,118,589.

When the hearings were held by the subcommittee the heads of the various bureaus charged with the expenditure of the money appropriated for them were called before the committee and made to justify every item recommended for appropriation in this bill.

Your attention is invited to the fact that there are 1,196 pages of printed hearings. The book containing the hearings is carefully indexed and any member who is not familiar with any item in the bill can turn to the index and find the page in

the hearings where the oral and documentary testimony is submitted justifying that item. I am confident the people of the country do not understand the degree of care that is given; first, by the subcommittee, and, second, by the full Committee on Appropriations, and, third, by the Committee of the Whole House in the preparation, consideration, and passage of these appropriation bills. Somehow the erroneous impression has gone forth that Members are able, through favoritism, to secure the insertion of items for their particular districts.

I want to say to the House that this is a nonpartisan bill, that it is a nonsectional bill, and that there is not a single suggestion of favoritism in any line or in any item of appropriation in this bill. It is true there are more items of appropriations for certain States, but this is because the activities over which the Department of the Interior has control are located in those States; but there are no discriminations against States where there are similar activities.

This bill appropriates for the office of the Secretary of the Interior and his clerical force here in Washington, and the amount carried in this bill for that purpose is \$850,000, the same amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, and which is \$15,400 less than was appropriated for this purpose the current fiscal year.

The next bureau appropriated for is the General Land Office. This includes not only the salaries of the employees of that office here in Washington but for the salaries of employees located throughout the country, and for the most part in the Western States. Two million one hundred and thirty-eight thousand and fifty dollars is carried in the bill for this purpose, this being \$500 less than was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and \$159,500 less than was carried for the General Land Office for the current year.

The next item is for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Indian population of the country, as estimated by the Indian Bureau, aggregates 354,940. In Oklahoma the number of Indians is given as 119,216. There were enrolled as members of the Five Civilized Tribes 101,506 Indians. It is not generally known that there are 33 Indian Tribes in Oklahoma. The State is correctly named "Oklahoma," meaning home of the red man. Approximately one-third of the Indians of the United States reside in Oklahoma. This bill, therefore, is of great importance to the people of that State, Indian and white.

This bill carries an appropriation for the Indian Service of \$13,714,509, and is an increase, as compared with the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, of \$117,500.

I want to call attention to two items in order to emphasize them: One is for education, exclusive of tribal funds, aggregating \$7,297,000, or an increase of \$186,000; and, second, under conservation of health, general relief, and hospital, \$1,390,000, and this latter sum is \$342,000 more than that appropriated for the past year.

The friends of the Indian throughout the country recognize that they can best be advanced through vocational and industrial education, and this is being stressed in all boarding and day schools where Indians are taught, and there has been a notable increase during the past few years. Complaint has been made that trachoma and tuberculosis are too prevalent among the Indians, and that not a sufficient amount has been appropriated for health work, and for that reason a very large increase is carried in this bill. Some few Indians are scattered throughout the Eastern States. There is one Indian reservation in New York State. A remnant of the Seminoles live in Florida, and they are the most primitive Indians in the United States. There are a few Choctaw Indians remaining in Mississippi, for whom a small appropriation is made in this bill. There are a number of Indians in North Carolina who hold their lands in common, and a Government Indian school is maintained there for their benefit. The greatest number of Indians, of course, are scattered throughout the Western States. Next to Oklahoma, Arizona has the largest number, 46,235 Indians. There are 23,000 in South Dakota, and New Mexico, California, Michigan, and Minnesota have a large Indian population.

Oftentimes the question is asked upon the floor of the House why we continue to make appropriations for Indians and why some of these appropriations have been increased. Up to about 25 or 30 years ago the Government dealt with the Indians as tribes. To illustrate, we dealt with the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma collectively as tribes. It cost very little to administer the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes from a governmental standpoint. The commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, commonly known as the Dawes Commission, was authorized under the act of Congress of March 3, 1893. It negotiated agreements with the Five Civilized Tribes looking to the allotment of their lands, the distribution of their money, and the

admission of their country to statehood. Agreements were finally made and ratified placing the responsibility upon the Government of the United States to make the rolls, individualize their lands, and distribute their money. Instead of dealing with the Five Civilized Tribes in their tribal capacity we had 101,506 allotments to make, money to distribute, heirships to determine, and innumerable individual matters connected with the affairs of each. By the various acts of Congress a large number of members of the Five Civilized Tribes have been freed from governmental supervision. It is now estimated that there are about 12,000 or less restricted Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes. But that does not paint the whole picture. The Indian Office is charged with the responsibility through its office in Washington and its field employees not only of supervising the ten or twelve thousand enrolled restricted Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes but the restricted heirs of deceased Indians who are not carried on the rolls, of course, must be supervised and cared for as individuals.

I detain you this long in order to bring to your attention the immense amount of detail that the Indian Bureau must supervise. Referring again to appropriations for schools, we are maintaining a number of industrial schools throughout the country where young men and young women are being educated in such a way as to enable them to go out and face the battles of life. Many of them are giving a good account of themselves and are doing a great deal toward the uplift of their people to whom they return. There has been some criticism as to the Indian employees throughout the country. I confess, and I am sure the other members of the committee will agree with me, that in my judgment practically all Indian employees are underpaid. I think that has been a just criticism for a number of years.

We have a large number of very faithful employees in the Indian Service. Many of them live in out-of-the-way places and away from social centers. They do not hold attractive positions. As one member of the committee, I would like to be able to raise the wages of many of the Indian employees. They are not paid salaries that will compare with other Government employees. I have particular reference to those teaching in Indian schools. The salaries of teachers throughout the country have been greatly increased, and I am sure I am conservative when I state that as a whole the teachers in the municipal and State schools receive on an average double the compensation of teachers in the Indian Service.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton], paid a deserved compliment to those in charge of the Indian Service. I would not be fair to myself if I did not join in a word of commendation of the head of the Indian Bureau and of his very efficient assistant. Many of the older Members of the House served in Congress with Mr. Burke. They remember his service on the Indian Affairs Committee. For a number of years he served as chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee. His home is in South Dakota, in an Indian atmosphere, where he has been able to gain much personal knowledge of the Indians. I believe he has made one of the most efficient Commissioners of Indian Affairs we have ever had. We may find occasion to disagree with him on some details, but upon the whole I believe that his office has been sympathetically administered and in the interest of the Indian. He has been ably assisted by Mr. Meritt, the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs. I do not believe there is a man in the service of our Government who knows more about the details of his particular bureau than does Assistant Commissioner Meritt. He has been in the Indian Service for a quarter of a century. He is not only honest but he is efficient and courteous, and under the present management of the Indian Bureau there has been continued improvement in the service.

The next bureau for which this bill provides is the Pension Office. The appropriation for that office is \$231,738,000, the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

It may be of interest to the Members of the House and the country generally to know that on June 30, 1927, there were carried on the pension rolls 489,942 names. Forty-one thousand nine hundred and ninety-four pensioners died during the year 1927, of whom 16,958 were Civil War soldiers and 20,828 were Civil War widows. Seventeen of those carried on the rolls are widows of the War of 1812, and there are six survivors of the War with Mexico. The total number of Civil War pensioners, including the widows of survivors of the Civil War, on June 30, 1927, numbered 302,691. There were 162,638 Spanish-American War pensioners. The present law provides for a minimum pension of \$65 per month for all Union soldiers who saw service in the Civil War for 90 days and received an honorable discharge, and \$50 per month for all widows of Civil War soldiers who were married to and living with their husbands during the war. It

provides \$30 per month for all such widows who married their husbands subsequent to the Civil War and prior to June 27, 1905.

The following table shows the total amount paid to pensioners, 1790 to end of fiscal year 1927:

War of the Revolution	\$70,000,000.00
War of 1812	46,172,521.05
Indian wars	31,513,894.62
War with Mexico	58,056,020.69
Civil War	6,951,413,812.70
War with Spain	239,227,907.53
Regular Establishment	78,381,522.64
World War	219,966.55
Unclassified	16,513,425.54
Total	7,491,499,071.32

Appropriations are made for the Reclamation Service of \$12,729,000, for the Geological Survey of \$1,758,080, for the National Park Service of \$4,654,950, for the Bureau of Education \$941,300, for the government in the Territories and the Alaska Railway \$1,599,200, for St. Elizabeths Hospital \$1,313,000, for the Columbia Institution for the Deaf \$130,000, for Howard University \$390,000, for Freedmen's Hospital \$474,500, and these various items all aggregate the grand total of \$272,430,789.

A study of the various items contained in this bill covers such a wide range that consideration must be given to the expansion and development of the interior of our country.

I am glad to join with the other members of our subcommittee in bringing to the attention of the Members of the House the recommendations as set forth in this bill for the various bureaus of the Interior Department supervised by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I rise to thank my personal friend, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Hastings], whose district joins mine, for paying a deserved and handsome tribute to Mr. Meritt, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who is a legal resident of my town in Arkansas, and who, as he says, has been an important factor in the Indian Bureau for the past 25 years.

Permit me also in this connection to say that the membership will recall that daring woman, Mrs. Frances Wilson Grayson, who with her crew took flight from Roosevelt Field, New York, on December 23 last in an endeavor to be the first woman to fly from America to Europe. This brave woman who is supposed to have been lost at sea was born in my district, 25 miles from my home, and was born near the birthplace of my distinguished friend from Oklahoma [Mr. Hastings]. In this connection I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma how far from Cherokee City in my district is the place where he was born?

Mr. HASTINGS. Some 10 or 12 miles.

Mr. TILLMAN. In this connection, as a part of my remarks, to appear with them, I ask unanimous consent to insert a brief account of Mrs. Grayson, and a few facts touching on her family and early life.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILLMAN. In that connection, under unanimous consent, I submit the following:

Though far from the scene of the disappearance of the *Dawn*, amphibian plane of Mrs. Frances Wilson Grayson, intrepid woman flier and her crew, who took off from Roosevelt Field, N. Y., December 23, much interest in Mrs. Grayson and her disastrous attempt to be first woman to fly to England from America was aroused in Benton County when it was learned that Mrs. Grayson was born in the county and that her parents and early history were known to many residents of the county.

Frances Wilson was the daughter of Andrew J. and Minnie Lewis Grayson, and was born at Cherokee City, near Gentry, June 25, 1887. Andrew J. Wilson and his father, "Billy" Wilson, had a store and managed the post office at Cherokee City in the early days of the village, which resulted largely from a boom in 1881 and 1882, when the springs located there brought a large tourist trade. "Billy" Wilson carried the mail from Springdale to Cherokee City, and it is said that he computed the distance between the two places by tying a rag to a cart wheel and counting its revolutions. The house in which Frances Wilson was born was located about a block from the present post office at Cherokee City and was torn down about two years ago. When she was about a year old the family moved to Oklahoma, where her father farmed and operated a threshing machine for about four years, moving then to Muncie, Ind., where he now is engaged in the grocery business. The mother of Mrs. Grayson has been dead for several years.

RECALLED BY RESIDENT

John Lamphere, aged 64, and a neighbor and friend of the Wilson family during the residence of the family in Cherokee City, when asked about them, said:



"I was well acquainted with Andy Wilson and his wife. Her name was Minnie Lewis. She was a daughter of Preacher Lewis. She was a pretty girl and Andy was a fine looking young man, and they had about the worst case of being struck on each other I ever saw. They were engaged to be married. Andy had his license, and the time for the marriage was set for Christmas. Both their parents approved, but a few days before the wedding Andy and another young fellow went to Siloam Springs and while there they got too much liquor and got tipsy. Andy wasn't in the habit of doing this, but guess he was sorter celebratin' his coming marriage. Preacher Lewis heard of Andy's celebration and called off the wedding and forbid Andy to see the girl again. He kept her home for a few days until Sunday, then she came to Sunday school.

"Andy appeared on the scene to take her with him. Andy was headstrong and nearly always did what he started. Preacher Lewis was high-tempered and not afraid, and told Andy, 'No; you can't have the girl.' Andy said 'Yes,' and then the fight started.

"Several of the elders of the church pitched in to help the preacher, and some of the young bloods took a hand on Andy's side, and pretty soon there was a general fight going on right there in the church. In the mêlée Andy got Minnie away from the church and found Squire Fayette Blair on the street, and stepping upon a platform in front of a store, the justice of the peace married them before Preacher Lewis knew his daughter had left the church. In a few days the preacher's family welcomed their new son-in-law. Yes; I was there and saw them married. A big snow was on the ground at the time."

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to talk upon the subject of the postal air service to South America as well as a highway to the Latin-American countries. The President, in his message to the Seventieth Congress, stated he was interested in extending air mail service to South America as well as building public roads. In a recent interview he informed me it had been his hope for a long while to have a highway built from the State of Maine through Mexico to Central and South America.

Postal air service is now being established in every part of the civilized world, and even in parts of the world not yet civilized. The people of our country are demanding quick transportation of mails. South America is the greatest market in the world; it is a growing one; and it is a country to which in time we must send our surplus commodities. Many of those interested in commerce on the western coast of South America have appealed for an air service from the United States.

It now requires three weeks to carry mail from Santiago, Chile, to New York, three weeks in return, and probably two weeks more are consumed in answering. Millions and millions of American capital are invested along the west coast of South America. It is natural that our country would send exports to the west coast, but on the east, England, France, and Germany have the advantage over us in that part of South America. Millions are invested in railroads, nitrate mines, copper, and in the tin mines of Bolivia. It is important that we should have quick communication in order to increase our exports to South America.

Very few industries are now established in South America, almost all the manufactured commodities consumed there are imported either from the other side of the Atlantic or from the United States. Ninety per cent of the automobiles are of American make, and in all the large cities it is quite as difficult to cross the streets as in New York or Washington.

Great Britain, France, and Italy understand they must have quick communication in order to take advantage of their opportunities for selling commodities in South America. Mr. Van Bouer in 1922 established an air service from Cartagena on the northern coast of Colombia to its capital, Bogota. Formerly it took two weeks to go from the coast to the capital of Colombia. The air service now makes the trip in about two days. In 1922 the stock of the company operating the air line paid 3 per cent; last year it paid 10 per cent. Recently Mr. Van Bouer endeavored to obtain the exclusive franchise for air service along the coast of Colombia to Tumaco in order to prevent an American corporation dominating that part of the coast. Recently Mr. Van Bouer came to America and endeavored to form an American corporation. He was not successful, as it would not be advisable to permit a foreign corporation to sail over the Panama Canal Zone.

Captain Grow, who was formerly in the United States naval service, resigned and has recently established a mail route from Lima to Iquitos, the headwaters of the Amazon River. The only American air service in South America. It now requires four weeks for the ordinary mail service to reach the mouth of

the Amazon from Lima, the saving of two weeks in the transportation.

We have not fully realized the great market which South America is opening to the world.

The Latacoere Co., a French one, has recently been organized to carry mail from Natal, Brazil, to Dakar, Africa. By air service to the island of Fernando Noronha, which is about 300 miles from Natal; thence by special quick steamer service to the eastern coast of Africa, then by air service to Paris by the way of Casablanca, making the trip in about three and a half days from Rio de Janeiro and four and a half days from Buenos Aires. One can readily understand that this short time, as compared with three weeks from Buenos Aires to New York, would be of great commercial advantage to the foreign countries. The people of South America are just waking up.

Since the World War they have done a great deal to develop their country. But all this region [indicating on the map] is yet to be developed. They want agricultural implements, they want rails to build railroads, and they want cars. The United States might as well furnish these commodities as other countries.

I had an interview with President Laguna, of Peru; with President Selis, of Bolivia; and President Ibañez, of Chile. They expressed deep interest in establishing a mail service to South America.

A bill has recently been introduced into the House authorizing the Postmaster General to enter into contracts for the transportation of mails by air to foreign countries. I want to bring the importance of air service to the attention of the House, that we may realize the necessity of quick postal communication in order to hold our commercial relations with South America. We do not want it all, but we want our part, and if we do not wake up to the conditions that now exist Great Britain, France, and Italy will have the advantage. Of course, during the period of the war, when Germany, France, and Italy could not keep their manufactures going, we gained a great deal in exports to South America. I think our total exports to the whole world in 1926 were about \$4,800,000,000, and the exports from South America to the United States were about \$800,000,000.

I submit the following table of our exports to South American countries:

Domestic exports to South American countries  
[Thousands of dollars]

	From United Kingdom, 1926 <sup>1</sup>	From Germany, 1926	From France, 1925	From United States, 1926
Argentina.....	112,101	65,062	39,843	142,992
Brazil.....	61,264	44,986	21,783	95,252
Bolivia.....	2,629	2,040	5	5,131
Chile.....	27,527	16,729	10,021	48,738
Colombia.....	18,307	13,425	6,149	48,495
Ecuador.....	2,549	1,023	711	4,611
Paraguay.....	658	610	.....	900
Peru.....	11,414	4,790	1,145	29,145
Uruguay.....	11,548	6,822	17,141	22,806
Venezuela.....	11,128	6,624	2,318	39,500
Gulians:				
British.....	5,577	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	1,568
French.....	10	( <sup>2</sup> )	1	150
Dutch.....	403	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	1,569
Total exports to South America.....	265,115	162,111	89,117	440,917
Grand total of all exports.....	3,172,655	2,328,419	2,222,444	4,711,721
Per cent of South America of grand total.....	8.4	7.0	4.0	9.4

<sup>1</sup> Final figures; preliminary figures shown in Commerce Yearbook, 1926, vol. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Uruguay and Paraguay.

<sup>3</sup> Not shown separately but included in grand total.

<sup>4</sup> Includes \$60,000 exported to Falkland Islands.

I read in the paper some time ago that Colonel Lindbergh had arrived at Panama. Perhaps his flight to Central America will do more to bring about stronger social relations and good commercial conditions than the thousand of marines now in Nicaragua. The people in South America live in a different environment from ours, but we must have close communion with them if we wish to increase our commercial relations. We must first gain their confidence, and their confidence once gained, we must keep it in order to develop our commercial interests, and this can only be done by maintaining close relations between North and South America.

The President is very much interested in building a highway to South America. The Department of Commerce has accomplished much in this direction. In accordance with the sugges-

tion of the Department of Commerce, this [indicating on the map] is the route outlined for that highway.

In every country in South America, and I think in every country in Central America, there has been a revelation concerning the building of highways in the various Republics. You will notice on the map that a few miles have been constructed on either side of Mexico City. The great engineering trouble will be through Panama, because this is a swampy country and it is the home of the White Indians, and very few people have ever explored this White Indian district. If a road were built at present, it probably would have to be policed in order to be maintained. But civilization is going forward. Civilization will not stop, and, therefore, it is our duty not to let this opportunity go by but use our efforts to-day so that to-morrow we may find ourselves a step forward in developing the countries in Central and South America.

I wanted to take the time of the House to explain the air service that is now being established in South America—not by the natives of South America, but by foreigners—for the sole purpose of gaining commercial relations in South America.

I have taken all the time I desire to explain air service growing out of my short visit to South America. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, last October I received a letter from Mr. Harlan Wood, a reputable lawyer of Washington, who is an American Legion man, calling my attention to a letter which he had written to Commissioner Taliaferro, of the District of Columbia. Without taking the time to read this letter and the attached letter to the commissioner, I shall ask leave to place them in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to insert two letters in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letters are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 13, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I trust you will recall our acquaintance. May I send you the inclosed copy of a communication addressed to Commissioner Taliaferro, in which I give him a synopsis of the duties of the United States Bureau of Efficiency and the action of the veteran organizations with reference to it. There are approximately 12,000 ex-service men and women in the Government service in Washington. You can count on your fingers the ones who favor this bureau. They would be indebted to you if you could secure the abolition of this office.

There were 62 delegates at the department convention of the American Legion, only 2 of whom voted against and fought the passage of the inclosed resolution. You will be interested to know that they were William Wolf Smith, of the Veterans' Bureau, and Daniel J. Donovan, District auditor. Notwithstanding their opposition as spokesmen for the resolution, I secured its passage by the majority above stated. I believe I can convince anyone—and I am not egotistical—that this bureau has forfeited all right to further existence.

In our last conversation you also agreed with me that you believed from the standpoint of an economical and efficient administration the other personnel bureaus of the Government, namely, the Personnel Classification Board, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and the civil service, should be abolished and their duties consolidated either with the Civil Service Commission or into one bureau.

You will get strong support for such a movement, not only from the veteran and labor organizations but many others of a national scope, as well as earn the reward of rendering a distinctive service to the country generally. As far back as 1924 Congressman LEHLBACH, of New Jersey, was working and still is on certain phases of this consolidation, and in his prepared speech of February 12, 1924, on the subject before the House he listed over 12 national organizations who favored this action.

However, the most obnoxious of these bureaus is the United States Bureau of Efficiency. A late press report says that the District has adopted 40 of the 75 recommendations of this bureau. How long and how far can this transgression proceed? I think you can demand of the comptroller by what authority of law he authorizes the payment of salaries for the employees of this bureau engaged in this investigation work. So far as I can ascertain the most liberal construction of the acts of Congress gives it no such power, even for the executive departments of the Government, much less the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

I know you are very busy, but I hope you will take the time to go into the matters outlined in this and the inclosed communication. If I am wrong in anything, I am more than willing to be corrected and to apologize for any injustice done.

I do not know what you intend to do, but don't hesitate to call on me for any service I can render. I am free to speak and have nothing but unselfish ends to serve. If any hearings before committees are had, I shall be available to present the views of veteran organizations supplemented by my knowledge of the bureau based upon my study of it.

I need not add the expression of appreciation we as veterans feel for you in the work you have done in our behalf. Though you may not need it, still, if you should ever, I can gladly furnish you with resolutions of indorsement for your generous treatment of ex-service men. I have a close and personal contact with J. Frank Parrish, of Honey Grove, Tex., one of the most influential legionnaires in Texas. Legionnaires possessing a vote are an influence for good to be reckoned with; the only thing to be considered is that they are not acquainted with the situation as we are here. It would not be presumptuous on your part to indicate a desire for such indorsements for use as you may see fit.

Cordially yours,

HARLAN WOOD.

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 29, 1927.

Hon. SIDNEY F. TALIAFERRO,

1801 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TALIAFERRO: Since 1924 it has fallen my lot on behalf of the American Legion and other veteran organizations of which I am either an active or honorary member to make a study of the United States Bureau of Efficiency for our membership on account of the numerous complaints registered against this bureau because of its alleged departure from the duties prescribed in the organic acts of Congress which created the bureau, which departure the veteran organizations and other individuals believe and feel has resulted to the detriment of a great many ex-service men. As a result of our study and investigations, the American Legion, at its national convention in Omaha, Nebr., in 1925, and again at Philadelphia, Pa., in 1926, and this department of the American Legion—and I believe the national organizations in Paris did indorse the latter's action in 1927—went on record favoring the abolition by Congress of this bureau and the transfer of its functions to the Civil Service Commission, from whence it originated. The numerous investigations which have been conducted in the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia, as well as in the executive departments of the Government, have forcibly convinced us of the justice and merit of our position and has been the subject of considerable discussion among the several posts of the American Legion in the District of Columbia, with the net result that whenever the justification of the action of the United States Bureau of Efficiency is involved that it is practically unanimously condemned.

Personally and members of the organizations to which I belong, in our criticism and fight against the United States Bureau of Efficiency, we believe, and have so expressed it, that the intrusion of this office into the affairs of the District of Columbia should justly cause your resentment and that of the other commissioners, not only because the bureau has gone beyond the scope of its lawful authority but also because of the impracticable, apparently useless, and presumptuous recommendations which it sponsors. I am writing you because of the fact that you are a lawyer and, of course, can analyze from that point of view the statutes which create this office.

The Bureau of Efficiency was originally created as a division of the Civil Service Commission by act of Congress approved August 23, 1912. It is short and I therefore quote it in full:

"The Civil Service Commission shall, subject to the approval of the President, establish a system of efficiency ratings for the classified service in the several executive departments in the District of Columbia based upon records kept in each department and independent establishment with such frequency as to make them as nearly as possible records of fact. Such system shall provide a minimum rating of efficiency which must be attained by an employee before he may be promoted; it shall also provide a rating below which no employee may fall without being demoted; it shall further provide for a rating below which no employee may fall without being dismissed for inefficiency. All promotions, demotions, or dismissals shall be governed by provisions of the civil-service rules. Copies of all records of efficiency shall be furnished by the departments and independent establishments to the Civil Service Commission for record in accordance with the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That in the event of reductions being made in the force in any of the executive departments no honorably discharged soldier or sailor whose record in said department is rated good shall be discharged or dropped or reduced in rank or salary. Any person knowingly violating the provisions of this section shall be summarily removed from office and may also upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year." (37 Stat. L. 413.)

In 1916 the Division of Efficiency of the Civil Service Commission was literally picked up out of the Civil Service Commission and established as the present United States Bureau of Efficiency. The language of the act of Congress is quoted in full, as follows:



"Hereafter the Division of Efficiency of the Civil Service Commission shall be an independent establishment and shall be known as the Bureau of Efficiency; and the officers and employees of the said division shall be transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency without reappointment, and the records and papers pertaining to the work of the said division and the furniture, equipment, and supplies that have been purchased for it shall be transferred to the said bureau: And provided further, That the duties relating to efficiency ratings imposed upon the Civil Service Commission by section 4 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved August 23, 1912, and the duty of investigating the administrative needs of the service relating to personnel in the several executive departments and independent establishments imposed on the Civil Service Commission by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 4, 1913, are transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency." (39 Stat. L. 15.)

The provision of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913, relating to the administrative needs of the service referred to in the immediately preceding act is in full as follows:

"The Civil Service Commission shall investigate and report to the President, with its recommendations, as to the administrative needs of the service relating to personnel in the several executive departments and independent establishments in the District of Columbia, and report to Congress details of expenditure and of progress of work hereunder at the beginning of each regular session." (32 Stat. L. 750.)

You will note that the above act of Congress creating the Bureau of Efficiency (39 Stat. L. 15) is tacked on to the deficiencies appropriation act of February 28, 1916, chapter 37. In other words, it is not an independent act of Congress but an appendix to an appropriation act.

The only other statute with which I am familiar, and I have challenged the bureau's defenders for correction, that has any bearing on the United States Bureau of Efficiency is that recorded in Forty-first Statutes at Large, page 343, approved November 4, 1919. It is quoted in full as follows:

"That the Bureau of Efficiency is directed to investigate the scope and character of statistics needed by the Government, and the methods of collecting, compiling, and presenting statistical information by the several executive departments and independent Government establishments and submit to Congress a report of its findings together with such recommendations as it deems proper." (41 Stat. L. 343.)

It is barely possible that some subsequent appropriation act may carry language which could be interpreted to give authority to the Bureau of Efficiency for its present apparent undertakings. I have challenged the supporters of the bureau for such authority and the challenge remains unanswered. Hence, I think it is fair to assume that no authority exists covering the duties not prescribed in the organic acts of Congress that created this office, and if there were any language I believe a judicial construction of it would be to the effect that the investigations would relate to the duties as prescribed in the act of Congress rather than those duties that might pertain to investigations conducted by a grand jury, Department of Justice, prohibition agents, or internal-revenue agents.

The duties of the Bureau of Efficiency from the foregoing acts of Congress can be summarized and relate strictly to the "personnel in the executive departments of the District of Columbia"; that is, to establish an efficiency rating system, administrative needs of service relating to personnel, and to collect, compile, and present statistical information for the executive departments. I find no authority or anything relating to business methods, mechanical devices, administrative policies, municipal government of the District of Columbia, or any of its departments. Inasmuch as the duties are prescribed by Congress, I believe that the justification of the bureau in its position that the Gibson committee has requested it to do the things that it is doing is unfounded in fact and law and that the Gibson committee has no authority to require such services. The veteran organizations and the vast majority of individuals who compose them have no complaint whatever to make as to the merit or demerit of any recommendations that may have been made. Their complaint is due to the fact that the Bureau of Efficiency has not established a system of efficiency ratings based upon fact according to the records as kept whereby the protection afforded by the act of Congress of August 23, 1912, is really effective.

The first condition precedent to make the act of Congress of August 23, 1912, effective was to secure the approval of the President to the system established. This was not done until October 24, 1921, by Executive Order No. 3567, and then only at the insistence of the veteran organizations, so that from 1912 to 1921 the first condition precedent prescribed in the act had not been complied with. Our court of appeals has stated the same in the cases of *Pershing v. Daniels* and *Dean v. Burleson* (43 App. D. C. 470). At the time of these decisions the Bureau of Efficiency was still a part of the Civil Service Commission, known as the division of efficiency, and this accounts for the language used in the decision of the court of appeals, as follows:

"Under the former laws the courts had no power to review the action of the head of a department in discharging an employee for inefficiency. August 23, 1912, the act of Congress was passed, which

is relied on in this case as changing that rule. Passing by the question whether the navy yard in Washington is a part of the executive department of the Navy within the terms of that act, we assume, for the purposes of this case, that it was so intended. It appears, nevertheless, that the Civil Service Commission had never exercised the authority conferred thereby to establish a system of efficiency ratings for the classified service in the several executive departments of the District of Columbia. That this proviso exempted discharged soldiers from discharge or dismissal has no effect. The proviso is a part of the section and is not intended to have an independent operation."

It is the serious contention of the veterans now in the executive departments of the Government that the system which was established and is now in vogue is not based upon fact, and that the administration of it is detrimental to their rights. Hence they have recommended and indorse the action of their organization in requesting Congress to abolish the United States Bureau of Efficiency and transfer its functions back to the Civil Service Commission. As a matter of fact, Congressman GIBSON, at the request of the national organization of the American Legion, introduced at the last session of Congress a joint resolution to abolish the United States Bureau of Efficiency and transfer its functions to the Civil Service Commission, and a similar act will be introduced at the coming session of Congress.

The Bureau of Efficiency has ingratiated itself in the hearts of a number of influential Members of Congress, because it has been at the disposal of these men, particularly Senator SMOOR and Congressman BLANTON. I believe it was virtually sustained in the House by the activity of Congressman BLANTON alone. On February 12, 1924, Congressman LEHLBACH, of New Jersey, delivered a condemnation of its activity that was most severe.

I believe there is going to come a time when you will find that this office will be endeavoring to dictate to you and the other commissioners as to how the District government should be conducted. I believe that you should have the benefit of the study that I have made as outlined above and the acts of Congress, which I believe give the Bureau of Efficiency no authority to meddle in your affairs and those of the District government, even though the President of the United States should request it, because such action transcends its lawful duties and because, as you well know, we are governed by laws and not men. I believe I can appreciate in a measure the possible delicacy of your position, but at the same time I feel that when the conflict comes, which it will ultimately, you and the other commissioners will be perfectly justified in suggesting to the Bureau of Efficiency that it stay in its own back yard and do its own knitting.

So far as I am aware from the United Spanish War Veterans and Veterans of Foreign Wars, Army and Navy Union, and American Legion, no criticism has been directed or urged for or on behalf of the individuals connected with the United States Bureau of Efficiency. At the last department convention of the American Legion I was chairman of the resolutions committee and sponsored for that committee the inclosed resolution, which was passed with only two dissenting votes. I stated in my argument, and I state to you, that what I have written is not based upon any prejudice against the Chief of the Bureau of Efficiency or any of its personnel. I do not have his acquaintance and I would not know him should I see him; however, he owes it to himself, and in justification of the conduct of his bureau to satisfy the organizations referred to above, that what he is doing is authorized by law. No individual encourages a conflict with any branch of the Government or any public official, especially when it means nothing to him personally, yet where unselfish and charitable ends are sought one may speak freely. For these reasons and because I am friendly to your administration I trust no undue publicity will be given to this communication, though you are at liberty to show its contents to anyone directly concerned or having your confidence.

That it may reach you personally I am forwarding it to your residence.

Cordially yours,

HARLAN WOOD,  
201-204 McLachlen Building.

COPY OF RESOLUTION PASSED AT THE CONVENTION OF 1927 OF THE AMERICAN LEGION FOR THE JURISDICTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
Resolution 7

Whereas the American Legion at its national conventions at Omaha, Nebr., in 1925 and in Philadelphia, Pa., in 1926 passed a resolution at the request of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, calling upon Congress to abolish the United States Bureau of Efficiency, United States Personnel Classification Board, and the United States Workmen's Compensation Commission and to transfer their functions to the Civil Service Commission; and

Whereas it is the belief of ex-service men, as expressed by them at the national convention of the American Legion in the aforesaid action, that the United States Bureau of Efficiency has been grossly negligent and utterly indifferent in performing the duties required of it by law in the establishment and maintenance of a system of efficiency ratings based upon fact whereby ex-service men and women may have the protection afforded by law; and

Whereas it is the belief of ex-service men that the United States Bureau of Efficiency particularly has greatly transgressed its lawful duties with great resulting detriment to ex-service men: Now, therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American Legion of the Department of the District of Columbia again requests the national convention of the American Legion to indorse and do its utmost to secure the passage of acts of Congress to effectuate the foregoing consolidation of the personnel bureaus of the Government; be it further

*Resolved*, That the delegates of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, to the national convention be, and they are hereby, instructed to use every effort to secure the passage of this resolution by the national convention.

Mr. BLANTON. There is an organization of reputable citizens in Washington which desired to obtain information showing the number of employees and their salaries in the Bureau of Efficiency. One of its officers is Frederick William Wile, who is a distinguished journalist of high character and, in my judgment, one of the ablest in Washington. This information was denied to this organization. Was their request outrageous? They were citizens and taxpayers of this Nation, and it was their money and taxes that paid such salaries. Did they not have the right to know about their own business? But they were denied such information. They applied to the United States Civil Service Commission for such information. When their request was turned down they went into the local courts here and brought action to compel such information to be furnished them. But the courts held it should come through other sources. They were denied that information. The president of such organization appealed to me as a Member of Congress to get this information for him, relating the shameful way these citizens had been treated.

I wrote a letter to the chief of this bureau following that as a Member of Congress. We vote the money that pays their salaries. We are the ones who represent the 110,000,000 people of the United States whose money pays the expense of this bureau. I felt that as one Member of Congress I would have the right to the information and I wrote this letter. I want you to note it. Is there anything unreasonable about it? Is there anything disrespectful about it? Is there anything about it that would keep a bureau chief of the Government from furnishing the information asked for? Let me read it:

Washington, D. C., October 17, 1927—

That is just four days after Judge Harlan Wood wrote me his letter, and on the same day the president of this citizens' organization of the District appealed to me to get the information for them. The people of Washington have no representative in this Congress. Unless we represent them they are without representation, a city of 600,000 people, if you please. Apprised of such facts, I wanted such information for my own use and to put before my committee, and I requested it on their behalf also:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., October 17, 1927.

Hon. HERBERT D. BROWN,

Chief, Bureau of Efficiency, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BROWN: For information to be used before our committee when it meets, I will ask you to please send me the following information:

- (1) The names and respective salaries drawn of all officers in your bureau.
- (2) The names and respective salaries drawn of all other employees in your bureau.

Please let me have the above information at the earliest date possible and oblige,

Very truly yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

Is there anything unreasonable about that? Have not we Members of Congress the right to get such information from bureau chiefs? Are the bureau chiefs bigger than the power that creates them?

He first promised to send me this information, and then I understood on the outside that he found I had been requested by certain organizations to get it, and I understood he then decided he would not let me have it. Then I called on him for the truth as to whether or not he had received \$10,000 from a certain big corporation for doing work for them while he was chief of the Bureau of Efficiency. Not answering me directly but through the press, he in effect told me to go to; it was none of my business.

Mr. LARSEN (interposing). May I ask the gentleman whether he had already given his communication to the press that caused him to reply through the press?

Mr. BLANTON. Only after I had sent it to him and could not get the information. I did not give my letter of October 17,

1927, to the press at all. He first answered it on October 18, 1927, promising to give my request attention, and then after waiting an unreasonable time I learned from the press boys that he was going to ignore my request, because he did not want the citizens' associations of Washington to get hold of this information to use in checking up his bureau. And when he refused to give me this information, I then proceeded myself to check up his bureau and find out what it had been doing. And I learned that the du Ponts, of Delaware, had paid him about \$10,000 for work he had done for them, since he has been director, and supposed to give all of his time and attention to the Bureau of Efficiency. I then wrote him and asked him some specific questions asking him about the money paid him by the du Ponts, and instead of answering my questions by letter he went into the press and said that "it was none of the business of Congress what he did with his time after hours." I will tell you what one of the big daily newspapers of Houston, Tex., the great city where I was born, and in which the next Democratic National Convention will be held, says about Brown's position.

It says that any Member of Congress has the right to find out what is going on in this Government, and that when a Member of Congress who represents the people of the country calls on one of the bureau chiefs for information concerning the business of his office he should give it.

Brown is telling it around now that the reason he refused to give this information was that I was mad at him because he caused one of my friends to be demoted—Traffic Director Eldridge.

I am no better friend to Traffic Director Eldridge than I am to any other Government official who does his duty. I am the friend of the lowliest policeman and the lowliest fireman of this District who does his duty. I am just as much a friend of the lowliest as I am of Mr. Eldridge or any other honest Government official, but I believe in doing justice to everybody.

Let me read you what one of the Hearst papers said yesterday. Is it coming to pass that the people of the country can place no reliance whatever upon an article they find in one of Hearst's papers? I have never given any of the Hearst papers provocation to dislike me or to attack me or to be unjust toward me. I have been fair with them. I have wasted my time on many an occasion, when I was busy, in stopping and answering questions of their reporters. I have given them everything my office has had when they have called on me for it. Why should they put things in the paper that are not true in behalf of Efficiency Director Brown? Hearst paper said, in substance, that Eldridge and Congressman BLANTON were arranging to attack the Bureau of Efficiency and Mr. Brown because of its action concerning automobile traffic tags being made by one of the agencies of the District government with reference to favoring a certain corporation.

There is not a word of truth in this. Mr. Eldridge never in his life spoke one word to me about that situation. I did not even know that an agency of the District government made these tags. I knew nothing whatever about how the matter was arranged. It is absolutely made out of the whole cloth. There is not a word of truth in it. Not one single word has ever passed between Mr. Eldridge and myself about it.

Is this the kind of reputation Hearst wants to get over the country—that people can not rely on anything they find in his paper? I am a friend of Director Eldridge, because he is honest, fearless, able, efficient, conscientious, and reliable. He has enforced the law, and lawbreakers were influential enough to get his scalp.

Let me mention just two cases of the many which made Traffic Director Eldridge unpopular. On October 25, 1926, he was forced under the law to revoke the permit to drive an automobile of Stephen Paul Murphy, whose police record is as follows: On January 19, 1920, was arrested for speeding and forfeited \$5; on September 3, 1920, arrested for passing stop signal and given fine of \$15 or 15 days; on October 19, 1920, arrested for disorderly conduct and forfeited \$5; on November 6, 1920, was arrested for investigation; on November 28, 1920, arrested for having no District of Columbia tags and forfeited \$5; on December 7, 1920, arrested for disorderly conduct and forfeited \$5; on February 21, 1921, arrested for breaking glass in street and given fine of \$10 or 10 days; on March 3, 1921, arrested for investigation; on April 2, 1921, arrested, charged with fornication, and forfeited \$25; on September 10, 1921, arrested for disorderly conduct and forfeited \$5; and on the same date was also charged with cutting corner and forfeited \$5; also charged with passing on right of car and forfeited \$5; also charged with speeding, forfeited \$10; also charged with failing to show permit and forfeited \$5; and once more in 1921 was arrested for investigation; on January 22, 1922, arrested



for assault and forfeited \$5; and also on that date was charged by Officer Kelley with disorderly conduct and fined \$5 or 5 days; and again charged by Officer Spaulding with disorderly conduct and fined \$25 or 25 days; on February 6, 1922, was arrested for assault and forfeited \$10; on March 24, 1922, was arrested for using dead tags; on March 31, 1922, was arrested for colliding and fined \$15; on June 11, 1922, was arrested for speeding and forfeited \$15; on June 26, 1922, was arrested for breaking glass in street; on August 5, 1922, was arrested for assault; on August 7, 1922, was arrested for carrying concealed weapons and also for threats; on February 3, 1923, was arrested for disorderly conduct and forfeited \$5, and also for failing to give signal, forfeiting \$2; on March 2, 1923, arrested for Maryland authorities; on March 8, 1923, arrested for no permit and also for no tags and fined \$40; on June 4, 1923, arrested for affray, forfeited \$50; on June 22, 1923, arrested for disorderly conduct, forfeited \$5; on February 2, 1924, arrested for assault, forfeited \$25, and also on such date was arrested for disorderly conduct, forfeiting \$25; arrested for being drunk, forfeiting \$25, and also for assault on second party, forfeiting \$25; on May 30, 1924, arrested for disorderly conduct and forfeited \$5; on December 30, 1924, arrested for investigation; on January 6, 1925, arrested for assault and forfeited \$25; on March 9, 1925, arrested for reckless driving and for using smoke screen and demanded jury trial; on June 30, 1925, arrested for illegal possession, and also for transporting, and fined \$500 or 120 days; on July 12, 1925, arrested for disorderly conduct and forfeited \$5; on October 7, 1925, arrested for disorderly conduct and fined \$10, also for assault and fined \$15; on October 8, 1925, arrested for taking property without consent of owner; on February 10, 1926, arrested for disorderly conduct and fined \$10 or 10 days; on April 9, 1926, arrested for speeding 38 miles, fined \$25 or 25 days, also for improper lights; on April 15, 1926, arrested for reckless driving; on August 26, 1926, arrested by Officer Helmuth for reckless driving; on August 27, 1926, arrested by Officer Murphy for reckless driving and fined \$50 or 30 days, and also for retarding police and fined \$25 or 25 days; on August 28, 1926, arrested for violating traffic regulations, and the courts having certified to the traffic department records of conviction requiring under the law the revoking of his permit, Traffic Director Eldridge, on October 25, 1926, revoked such permit. But this Mr. Stephen Paul Murphy, being a prominent and high-hat bootlegger and a citizen of great substance and influence, was able to punish Eldridge by helping to bring him into disfavor and unpopularity through adverse criticism.

Another prominent bootlegger who has helped to make Traffic Director Eldridge unpopular is Arthur Mason, who has been charged with violations of the law in our police courts in 36 different cases; the charges embracing assault, disorderly conduct, being drunk, illegal possession, transporting liquor, operating an auto while drunk, selling whisky, speeding, driving without permit, driving with dazzling lights, colliding, and permitting gambling.

Unfortunately for Traffic Director Eldridge the law and his sense of duty has forced him to bother some of the official family of Hearst's newspapers. Based on an order of court he canceled the permit of Mr. Charles Miller, a pressman of the Washington Times-Herald. And based on a charge, which under the law forced him to do so, he canceled the permit of Mr. Forrest C. Phillips, a route agent of such newspaper. But in all of his actions Eldridge has been actuated by a high sense of conscientious duty.

To become traffic director at \$6,000 per year Hon. M. O. Eldridge sacrificed an honorable and desirable position with the American Automobile Association, which was paying him \$7,500 per year, he being induced to take this position by prominent citizens who were seeking to better traffic conditions in Washington. And he succeeded in bringing order out of chaos. To show how the members of the American Automobile Association felt about the great injustice done Eldridge I quote the following letter, written by one of its members—a prominent attorney of Washington—Hon. Thomas M. Fields, whose office is in the Woodward Building and whose residence is 2704 Twenty-seventh Street NW.:

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,  
Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Being out of sympathy with the recent demotion of Director of Traffic Eldridge to the position of assistant director of traffic at a salary decrease of \$1,200 per annum, and realizing his efficiency and integrity and the great good which he has accomplished in his efforts relative to the regulation and control of local traffic conditions, and recalling what he accomplished while he was connected with the association before he became the director of traffic, I suggest that the members of the association make up the deficiency in his salary by

voluntary contributions. In view of the large membership of the association, and the good will of all members toward Mr. Eldridge, quite likely all members will gladly contribute. The amount of each contribution would almost be negligible to make up the \$1,200.

Speaking for myself, I am willing to contribute up to \$100 if necessary, and my secretary, who is also a member of the association, will contribute up to \$10.

Is my suggestion worthy of consideration and adoption?

Yours very respectfully,

T. M. FIELDS.

Here is what happened and this is what Brown is ashamed of. My good friend from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], everyone knows how much I think of him and how I have commended him for the work that he has helped to do for the country, but he has gotten a little off. He has gotten into the byways where the briars are thick and he is not now doing much good in one respect. He deliberately, without any authority of law whatever, had the Bureau of Efficiency of the United States drop its work for the Government and begin to inspect the bureaus of the District of Columbia, which are merely municipal bureaus and are not bureaus of the Government at all, wasting its time on District bureaus when they have no authority whatever to inspect a single one of them. He has had Brown wasting the time of a whole organization down there.

Let me tell you just what he did. The first thing Brown did was to find out that Traffic Director Eldridge was enforcing the law against the big bugs, as well as the little ones here; that he was making the highbrows respect the law, and when the highbrows disobeyed the law, Traffic Director Eldridge was canceling their permits when the law required it, and they did not like it. Brown found out Eldridge was getting unpopular with many of the highbrows, and the commissioners saw these attacks in the papers and they thought they would make themselves popular, and do you know what they did? These commissioners, Mr. Taliaferro and Mr. Dougherty, wrote out a preliminary report for the United States Bureau of Efficiency to execute, calling for Eldridge's demotion and Moller's dismissal. Did they not do this, I will ask the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON]?

If they did not, I will let the gentleman deny that the commissioners wrote that preliminary report of the Efficiency Bureau and told Brown to sign on the dotted line, and he signed. Did they not do that?

Mr. GIBSON. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I had no personal knowledge as to what was done—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, but the gentleman knows who wrote that report.

Mr. GIBSON. Wait; I was not present and have no personal knowledge as to what action the commissioners and the Board of Efficiency took.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman know the commissioners told Brown to sign on the dotted line and he signed?

Mr. GIBSON. No; I do not, but I have been told so.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, that is sufficient. That is an admission against interest. [Laughter.] That is the fact. The commissioners prepared it and they told Brown to sign, and Brown signed.

And what did this report do? It caused them to kick out poor Colonel Moller on March 28, 1927, because of something they found out he had done outside of his office, out of hours, when his office was closed and which had nothing to do with the government of the District of Columbia. It was a social affair. They caused Director Eldridge to be demoted on April 1, 1927, for some complaint they lodged against Moller, and caused Eldridge's salary to be decreased \$1,200 annually when they knew there was not a single scintilla of evidence that affected his honesty; and I am going to prove that to you right now, because after months of investigation, here is Mr. Brown's final report filed in May, 1927, signed, "Herbert D. Brown, Chief of the Bureau of Efficiency," respecting Moller and Eldridge and the Crouse-Hinds Co., which was the firm solely involved in their entire investigation. The preliminary report, which the commissioners prepared for the United States Bureau of Efficiency, and which they caused Herbert D. Brown to sign on the dotted line, imputed dishonest and fraudulent transactions respecting the District of Columbia. That was before Brown's bureau fairly started its investigation.

Here is what Brown said in his final report concerning these men whose whole future he had ruined. After investigating he found them all not guilty. Here is the final report over Brown's own signature, from which I quote the following:

There is no evidence to show that either Colonel Moller or Mr. Eldridge was animated by dishonest motives or ever profited in any way from the irregularities or that the Government suffered any loss from such irregularities.

That is from page 1472 of the printed hearings. No evidence, he says, to show dishonesty, and here is what he says about the Crouse-Hinds Co., concerning whose contract all the fuss was raised, and over an item involving \$634. I again quote from said Herbert D. Brown's final report filed in May, 1927:

In justice to the Crouse-Hinds Co. it should be suggested that during the course of this investigation nothing was found to cause the slightest suspicion of dishonesty in the transaction on the part of the company. In our opinion that company should be absolved from any criticism in its dealings with the District of Columbia.

That report on May 27, 1927, caused Colonel Moller to be kicked out, and he and his family to have their lives ruined and Eldridge demoted.

Now, Colonel, when you get up to defend Brown and when you go to protect Brown trying to hedge around him where I can not get at the facts, you and I are at the parting of the ways.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not think the gentleman is correct in saying that I am protecting Doctor Brown or doing anything so that the facts can not be ascertained if they should be ascertained.

Mr. BLANTON. Let us see; my colleague knows that I am always fair. I like him even if I can not go with him.

Mr. GIBSON. Perhaps the gentleman will go with me.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I will not. Here is the situation. A member of our committee, known as the Gibson Investigating Committee, is Judge Houston, of Delaware. You will remember that it is a Delaware corporation that has paid Brown \$9,000, as Brown says; but I say \$10,000. Du Ponts paid it to this chief of the United States Bureau of Efficiency for what? Not working for the Government, but working for the corporation. I imagine it is the influence of my good friend Judge Houston, from Delaware, that is actuating my friend, Colonel Gibson, from Vermont, in his motive to keep me from getting the facts from Director Brown.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. BLANTON. I have had a resolution of inquiry pending before the gentleman's committee ever since Congress met in December.

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman refers to the Committee on the Civil Service?

Mr. BLANTON. Of which the gentleman from Vermont is a member?

Mr. GIBSON. And we gave you a hearing this morning.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; I will tell you what kind of a hearing you gave me. [Laughter.]

Mr. GIBSON. We heard everything the gentleman presented without objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Vermont—where the maple sap runs except next year—will the gentleman deny that the du Ponts paid as much as \$9,000 to Director Brown?

Mr. GIBSON. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the gentleman's information?

Mr. GIBSON. I have been told that covering a period of 13 years the company has paid Mr. Brown for advisory work on its retirement and pension system \$9,000.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman gets the information from Judge Houston and Mr. Brown?

Mr. GIBSON. I never passed a word with Mr. Houston about it.

Mr. BLANTON. Did not Brown tell you so?

Mr. GIBSON. I decline to tell the gentleman where I got my information until the Civil Service Committee gets through with the hearings.

Mr. BLANTON. I am surprised to find so valuable a man in this Congress—for he is a valuable man—as Colonel Gibson—standing up and protecting this man Brown from furnishing the information demanded by a Member of Congress. The du Ponts of Delaware have paid Brown.

Now, here is what happened this morning in the Civil Service Committee as long as the gentleman mentioned it. One member of the committee moved to report my resolution out as to the facts asked for, eliminating the \$10,000 proposition. Another member moved a second that the resolution be reported out. And the committee was about to report it. Then Colonel Gibson stepped in and offered a substitute that they would have another hearing first, and they would let Mr. Brown come up tomorrow and let me come before them again, wasting more of my time—not in the morning before noon, but at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon when the House is in session.

What right has your committee to meet when this House is in session? I ask that of the colonel from Vermont. None.

We have never granted his committee the right to meet when this House is in session. It has not the right to do so; and when you meet to-morrow at 2 o'clock you are meeting without any authority of law, against the rules of this House, and you are meeting when Congress has not authorized you to meet, just like you had poor old Brown and his bureau investigate this District municipality, when the law says that bureau must confine its operations to only Government plants.

Mr. GIBSON. May I suggest that I am not the chairman of that committee, and I assume that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH], will take all measures necessary to protect the proceedings of that committee within the rules of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to see how the gentleman acts in the morning, because in the morning the Gibson subcommittee, authorized by the District Committee, is to meet and investigate these various matters. The Gibson committee has met and voted to have a hearing, and it was agreed on that we would have that hearing at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning, and that Brown should be brought before the committee, and I expect to ask him some questions; but the press says, and the press has been saying continually, attempting to quote the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Gibson], that the gentleman from Vermont is going to protect Brown in this hearing and not let any questions be asked him.

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman refers to these same Hearst papers?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, all of the papers have been saying that, and I am going to find out to-morrow where the gentleman stands.

Mr. GIBSON. Oh, you will find out all right.

Mr. BLANTON. And I shall withhold my criticism until after that meeting, but I am going to tell my friend from Vermont this: I do not care who steps in and seeks to protect Brown, I am going to let the people of this country know who is protecting him when I find out. The people have a right to know how much the du Ponts have been paying him. The people have a right to know whether he has been spending his time for the Government or for private corporations. The people of this country have a right to know, and I am going to see to it that they do know that, and I have got the information all ready. I am not depending on Brown for my information. I have it from several sources in this Government already. I know every one of the facts.

Mr. GIBSON. Then, of course, the gentleman does not need any investigation.

Mr. BLANTON. But I want Brown to answer and give the facts about his office. We have a right to know. After my friend from Vermont, Mr. Gibson, sleeps on it to-night, I do not think he is going to protect Brown any more. Let me tell him this, that members of the American Legion who have had business with that Bureau of Efficiency condemn it and Brown. You will not find a labor organization in the District of Columbia that will say a good word for Brown, not one. Not a labor organization, and you will find only two men who will defend Brown. You will find Major Donovan, the auditor down here in the District government, whom Brown has taken care of, he and his family, and you find Poker Bill Smith down in the Veterans' Bureau defending him.

Mr. POYLAN. And who is Poker Bill Smith?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I am surprised that my friend from New York does not know him. That proves that my colleague has never played poker. Poker Bill, through politics, is general counsel for the Veterans' Bureau, and has tried to turn down the just insurance and just compensation that is due to widows and orphans of our soldiers time and time again. He has been responsible for it. They have had to take an appeal to McCarl to make him pay, and McCarl has made him pay it.

You should read the record and see how he tried to rob Mrs. Bertie Fenlaw out of her dead husband's insurance, and McCarl made him pay it. Poker Bill Smith never tried a case in a courthouse until after he became general counsel of the Veterans' Bureau. He is another protégé of a distinguished Senator, and that is the reason we can not get rid of him. If he was not a protégé of this distinguished Senator who has so much influence, Director Hines would have kicked him out long ago; but I made him admit in the presence of General Hines and Senator SHEPPARD that he never tried a case in a courthouse in his life until he became the general counsel for the Veterans' Bureau—the chief legal authority for the Veterans' Bureau—that passes on hundreds of millions of dollars for the 4,000,000 men who served, in the matter of insurance for their widows and children and mothers. These are the two protégés of a distinguished Senator—Brown and Poker Bill Smith. At the American Legion convention in 1926, and the



one preceding it, a resolution was offered condemning Brown and the Bureau of Efficiency and asking that the bureau be abolished; and I will put it in my remarks.

Mr. GIBSON. You mean the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I am talking about the National Convention of the American Legion of the United States. Then in the 1927 convention of the American Legion for the District of Columbia there was the resolution passed condemning the bureau and there were only two men who spoke and voted against it, and they were Donovan and Poker Bill Smith. That resolution passed unanimously in the American Legion district convention except for those two votes. They defended him. You are in bad company, Colonel! [Laughter.] You may be able to protect Brown, but I doubt it. I am going to wait for Brown to come across and give the information himself before I put it into the RECORD, but, Colonel, I am going to get the floor a little later on if you keep Brown from giving it, because we will have another appropriation bill up here, and I can get time, because my colleagues are good to me and they will give me time, and then I am going to come in, if you do keep him from giving the information, and I will give it to you second hand from other departments and bureaus of the Government. I will show the facts from other sources, if you do succeed in keeping Brown from answering questions.

I would rather give it first hand. If I do it I will give the name of every man who protects him. If a Senator protects him, I am going to give the Senator's name, and if a Congressman does it I will give you his name, without fear or favor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I have taken the floor expecting to consume part of the time I have been allotted in calling your attention to an article and to a picture contained in one of the publications gotten out by the Department of the Interior. I hold in my hand copy of a publication that is issued monthly by the Department of the Interior called *The New Reclamation Era*. I read on the second page of this publication:

Issued monthly by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.; price to other than water users, 75 cents a year.

So I take it that this publication goes free into the hands of all water users on the reclamation projects of the United States, and it also circulates generally throughout the United States on a subscription basis. I am sure that it goes into the offices of thousands and thousands of business men.

The issue that I hold in my hand is dated January, 1928. I want to say parenthetically that I am interested in reclamation. I made an address on the floor of the House about two years ago in which I attempted to outline my position on that subject, and also to commend, as many people in my section of the country do not, the work that is being carried on in the western States reclaiming and making valuable wonderful stretches of land that would be worthless without the reclamation work that is being carried on by our Government.

On page 7 of this particular issue of the *New Reclamation Era* I find a picture. It is inserted in an article that was written by May A. Schnurr, secretary to the commissioner and associate editor of the *New Reclamation Era*. I called Miss Schnurr over the telephone and asked her what the picture was intended to represent. Her reply was that their field agent went out and gathered pictures and gathered data relating to the subject matter that her department had under consideration. Her article deals largely with the South. The picture I referred to represents an old ox with very broad horns; he has on a shuck collar, a croker sack back band, and trace chains corresponding to the other equipment, and this is all hitched to one of those old hopper cotton planters; a barefoot colored boy is back of the equipment in an attitude of working, but the whole outfit is standing still. The land where the picture was made is not laid off in rows. No furrows are seen in this land, and no planting is going on, so that you can easily see that the picture is made on a "dress-up" occasion purposely to secure this kind of a picture, for effect and not to represent the truth.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I also noticed that article, and one on the next page showing a southern family of dark complexion. Knowing the connection between this article and the proposed

expenditure of Federal funds for farm development, it seemed like a strong showing of the need for such expenditure.

Mr. BUSBY. This picture is entitled "Methods still in use in the South." I want to say, gentlemen, that I am from Mississippi, the very heart of the South, and there are no such methods in that section of the country. So I asked Miss Schnurr if she had ever been in the South, and she answered, "I have not." She seemed to catch the trend of my mind and my object in calling her. She said, "I was absolutely confined in my article and the illustration to the material gathered by our field agent." I said, "What is the purpose in setting forth this picture which does not convey any idea of the real condition?" She replied by saying that that was the material furnished her, and she did not have anything else with which to fill in. I got the point that through the reclamation section of the work by our Government they wanted to make it really impressive on the country that we were in dire need of this assistance, and therefore it would be more agreeable to Congress to make the appropriation. I am not one of those who would come here and present any false cause in Congress that would induce it or prompt it to lend help to us in developing the country. I want to tell you in that connection an incident that happened near where I live.

A missionary school was maintained in that section in the South by a certain northern church, and one of the teachers wrote back to a newspaper in one of the Northern States depicting the horrible conditions in the South where the school was located. Her letter did not have in it any basis of truth. She knew it did not. When she was confronted with a copy of the article by some local people—it had gotten back to that section of the country—she explained in this way:

Unless we can make it appear awful bad we can not obtain funds that will be sent down here with which to run our school.

I am against conveying false pictures to the country or any part of it in order to make an appeal for funds with which to carry on school work, reclamation, or any other kind of work. The South has suffered much by such false propaganda and deliberate misrepresentation. I emphatically protest against that method.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to say that in my contact, for a long time, with that office I have come to know this young woman, and I am sure any error has been entirely unintentional, because she would not, I am sure, have done anything for the sake of creating a false impression or taking any advantage through a misrepresentation. There may have been a lack of familiarity with this that has led to an error. I think the question the gentleman has brought to the attention of the House emphasizes what I have felt for a long time with reference to this publication. Other Members of Congress, and, I think, other Members of my committee, have not been fully in accord with that view; but I believe there is too much of a tendency toward propaganda in that publication to justify its publication out of the reclamation fund.

I think that whenever a Government publication enters the field of advocating policies that are before Congress or before the country there is a danger of some abuse in that particular.

Mr. BUSBY. I thank the gentleman for his observation. It is not my purpose at this time to cast any reflection whatever on the young lady, because she was very fair in her statement. The only error she committed, perhaps, was in not having some knowledge of the correctness of the impression she was conveying to the outside world by means of the pictures she used in her article. I told her when the conversation was over that it was perfectly all right so far as I was concerned. She curried favor slightly with me by saying this particular picture was taken in Georgia. I said that was up to the fellows from Georgia, and that she might hear from them. She said she was very sorry this had all happened. But too easily we convey a false impression to some other parts of the country, and I think the South has been subjected to that kind of treatment too long and too often.

I was in Chicago not long ago. I went there with a committee of business men to try to interest one of the larger concerns of the country in the establishment of a milk plant in our town. They told us frankly they were much interested in our particular section of the country and in our particular proposition. They told us the matter had been taken up with their board of directors, and when the question was presented to the board of directors and they told them they were contemplating going to Mississippi, the first thing the president of the board did was to throw up his hands and say, "My God, do not take anything to Mississippi." You will see, therefore,

why I am talking against this kind of a publication and this kind of a picture being sent out by the Government.

If you are going to establish a business in some section of the country, you do not want to establish it where the kind of condition shown in this picture prevails. I want to tell you that this condition does not prevail in the South, and it is not true as to my State or any of the other Southern States, for I have been all over them.

I want to direct your attention for a moment to the rapid development and organization of capital in my particular State of Mississippi. Within the last few years capital for the purpose of carrying on enterprises which will develop the home and develop the farm has been steadily increasing in my State. I am taking these figures from the State auditor's report of last week. In 1923, \$10,617,000 of foreign capital was organized to do business in the State of Mississippi; in 1924, \$4,218,000. Note the figures. In 1925, \$6,098,000; in 1926, \$219,807,000; in 1927, \$586,008,000. We are growing by leaps and bounds. That is the way we are growing and not as the picture in the New Reclamation Era suggests.

In Mississippi we have advertised a great deal lately for the purpose of showing the country the advantages of that great State. For four years each year there has been organized a know Mississippi better train, and there hardly exists any section of our country that has not been visited by this train. It is composed of about 200 or 300 people. They have three or four exhibit cars, and this train makes a three or four weeks' tour of the country. Last September they went to the Pacific Coast and visited almost every State in the western part of our country. They made stops at various places, showed the exhibits, and let the country see what is in Mississippi and see the things we have done in the way of capital investment. If we are to be faced by a publication issued by our Government, giving the country any such picture as the one I have called to your attention, a publication going out under the authority of the Department of the Interior, certainly our efforts to show the greatness of our State will be very much minimized by the impression received through this kind of a picture. I for one want you to understand, and the country as generally as it can from my humble words, that this picture is not true to life or true to conditions as they exist in the South. We are as progressive in every way as any other section of the country; we use as modern machinery as any other section of the country; and get as good results in every line as any other section of the country.

I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee for a moment.

This morning during the course of the gentleman's remarks I asked him a question in reference to the personnel of the Pension Bureau. In looking over the hearings, at page 705, I read from the testimony of Mr. Scott, the Commissioner of the Pension Bureau:

As will appear from additional statements, to be submitted in this connection, new legislation has materially increased the work of the bureau. While the adjudication of claims and the payment of pensions have been pushed with the utmost diligence, it has been necessary, by reason of a limited personnel, to curtail or suspend other important activities which should be resumed as speedily as possible.

Turning to page 717 of the hearings, I find a table in reference to the average number of employees in the bureau, as follows:

In 1924, 878; 1925, 807; 1926, 763; 1927, 693; 1928 (estimated), 620; 1929 (estimated), 615.

My inquiry is due to the delay in the Pension Bureau in adjudicating claims of war veterans. The applications of the Spanish war veterans came in by the thousands after the Congress made the minimum pension \$20 per month. The call is made on the War Department or the Navy Department for a report, which requires about two months. The men are then ordered before a medical board. It takes all the way from 6 months to 12 months to get a final decision on a claim.

Heretofore in the handling of pensions the pension generally commenced from the date the application was filed. It has been the policy recently of the bureau to date the pension from the day the applicant appeared before the examining board. The men entitled to pensions by reason of the law are required to wait all the way from 6 months to 12 months for their money, and it is necessary in most instances for a Member of Congress to get behind the claim before you can secure action in less than six months.

I am not finding fault with the Pension Bureau. I am finding fault now with the committee for not getting at the facts if they know these conditions exist, and I can not see how the members can not know they exist, because they are getting complaints from the Spanish War veterans.

If the Commissioner of Pensions states that he has a limited personnel and the Congress sees fit to increase the work of the bureau, it is beyond me to understand why he is not entitled to more money to carry out the purposes of the act. I would like to know the views of the committee as to why the bureau is going to reduce the force instead of increasing it.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman forces a statement that I would not have cared to make, but it is the product of my contact with this bureau. I believe that with the force they have they ought to be able to give the service the gentleman asks for.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Well, they are not giving it. The gentleman will admit that.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, I accept the gentleman's statement and his criticism of the service. I have no personal knowledge of it, but I accept his statement, and I took it the gentleman wanted me to speak at this time.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. For that reason I have made this statement. Furthermore, I will state that it is more difficult to get a positive, definite, fixed statement of the needs of this bureau than any other bureau I have anything to do with. As I indicated when I spoke before, one theory is presented to you and then they think it over and it is something different.

I have here the notation I made on my committee print of the bill when the commissioner was before us. The gentleman will find that we went up and down the matter, and the gentleman will find the hearings show the difficulty of getting a right, pointed, positive answer on something they ought to have been thinking about for months, if there is any such necessity as the gentleman speaks of.

The Budget estimate is \$1,150,000 for salaries, and I entered a note at the time of the hearing, as a result of our examination of the commissioner, "Wants \$1,160,000." This is what our hearing led up to, and that left a difference of \$10,000 between the Budget and the commissioner. On an item of \$1,150,000 that is not very much.

The gentleman will find, if he goes over these hearings for several pages, that we were given to understand the appropriation for the current year is not enough and that the work requires them to decrease their force more than they think they should decrease it. This was not a problem before my committee. This is a problem that should be before the deficiency committee. We are treating not the current year but next year.

We had trouble finding out from them how many men they would have at the end of this year or at the beginning of the next fiscal year. First they talked like it would be 600, and finally they told me they ought to have 615. Whether they have that many or not is not before my subcommittee. My subcommittee was recommending funds to begin the 1st of next July, and the gentleman will find, after some difficulty, as I say, a statement at the bottom of page 720, as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON. Is that your statement, Mr. Commissioner, that you should have at the end of this year 615 employees instead of 600?

Mr. SCOTT. I think we should have 615 employees at the end of the year.

Mr. CRAMTON. If you have 615 employees the 1st of July, is it your theory that you need to continue that number through the next year?

Mr. SCOTT. It is.

Mr. CRAMTON. Have you made a pretty careful study of the situation with reference to the work resulting from new legislation, etc.?

Mr. SCOTT. We have been behind, you understand, for two years.

As a matter of fact, when I came to this bureau we had some 900 employees, and we are down now to 635. We are doing more work with the reduced force, and I think I have reduced it just as far as I can.

Mr. CRAMTON. So, the 615 is your idea of what you ought to have the 1st of July, and you ought to have an average of that the next year?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Now, let me read this again:

Mr. CRAMTON. So, the 615 is your idea of what you ought to have the 1st of July, and you ought to have an average of that the next year?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is what the Budget appropriates. One million one hundred and fifty thousand dollars is sufficient to take care of your needs next year, as approved by the Budget and as stated by you here?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.



You will find that the Budget states that the allocation of that fund is for 615 employees which the commissioner told us was what was needed.

You can get from the hearings statements that the funds for current year are slightly inadequate, and which may force him to decrease his force before the 1st of July, but that question was not before our committee.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. That will not correct the situation from my standpoint, because the situation exists to-day that existed before.

Mr. CRAMTON. There might be such a thing as inefficiency in administration.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Scott states, "We have been behind, you understand, for two years." That bears out my statement of the situation of the bureau that something ought to be done. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will insist on a survey of the bureau to determine what they do need.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have not had the experience the gentleman speaks of, but I know similar complaints had been brought to my attention and hence we brought out in the hearings all we could as to what was needed. Here is a responsible head of a bureau who has been complaining, but he says that instead of reducing the force further he ought to have not below 615, that if he has 615 next July it will be sufficient.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. No doubt the commissioner has hanging upon his wall the word we hear so much about, "economy." I am for protecting the taxpayer's money but the taxpayer does not ask for economy at the expense of the ex-service men.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, as long as we are on the topic of the Bureau of Pensions I want to make some observations from my own experience and that of some other Members who I feel certain have had similar experience to my own.

We all have numerous claims for pensions. In some cases it is necessary to go into a great amount of detail and thought and study and advice as to the character of the evidence, in going over the evidence, and then in submitting the claim, and when there is a close question involved of analyzing that evidence in a letter to the Pension Commissioner when the claim is under discussion. It seems to me if a Member of Congress can give all that time and detailed thought and study to a single claim there ought to be some one in the office of Commissioner of Pensions who would give the same thought and study in handling the claim and in the correspondence regarding it.

During the past year while at home there were several claims of that character, and with the claim and in connection with the correspondence I went into considerable detail discussing the evidence and putting it up in detail somewhat like a lawyer would handle a matter in court.

Now, what did I get when the claim was turned down? I am not complaining because they were turned down; it may be that they were right, but I am complaining about the way the claims were and now are handled.

In answer to all the detailed correspondence, there was sent a carbon of the letter sent to the claimant saying that the claim was rejected, and nothing else. In other words, you get a letter, and from that letter you would not know whether anybody ever read the file or understandingly passed on the point that you looked into so carefully in preparing and presenting the case.

I took the matter up with the commissioner and wrote him I thought it was a queer thing that a Member of Congress, after putting that amount of work into a case, could get out of his office nothing but a carbon copy of a letter giving the conclusion, addressed to the claimant. He came back and said that the blame rested on Congress; that he did not have sufficient clerical force to write the letters and so sent a carbon copy. I then wrote him that I did not care so much about its being a carbon copy if he could get some one to intelligently go over the files and answer the correspondence and let me know the situation. He came back and said that he did not have sufficient appropriation to handle correspondence in that way. So I took the matter up with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

As I recall it, I passed on some of the correspondence to him. The chairman of the committee advised me that, in his judgment, the fault was not with the appropriation but with the commissioner. I find now that in the commissioner's appearance before the committee he said he was satisfied with 615 men that have been allotted him by the Budget for the next year, which I think is about 15 more than they have this year. The two statements do not jibe. Either what is written to me is not the case or else he should have frankly told this subcommittee that

Congress had been too niggardly and that he could not take care of this situation in a competent way, and he should then have asked for more money.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. Is it not true that the heads of the different bureaus are under instructions not to ask the committees of Congress for more than the Budget states, and that they are under severe penalty if they do that?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. NEWTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is entirely true, but our subcommittee has followed the practice, when they have reason to believe that a situation ought to be developed, of attempting to develop that situation, as we did in this case, because the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON] had called the matter to my attention. You will find that I got from the commissioner a statement that they really needed \$217,500,000 instead of \$210,000,000 for the payment of pensions, and we gave him ample opportunity to respond to our inquiries, because the law that is mentioned does not apply if Congress asks for the information.

Mr. LEAVITT. But they are under the difficulties just the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT] has said, that by reason of a provision of law, which is necessary as such, there is a possibility of a chief of a bureau being embarrassed by coming out and saying frankly what he should have; but after all, if this Budget system is going to work as we want it to work, there ought to be men in charge of these bureaus who would take Congress at its word, and if they feel that they are justified in asking for additional moneys, that they have been unduly cut down, should talk frankly with the Members of Congress and frankly with the subcommittee in charge of the appropriations. I feel in connection with this particular matter that there has not existed that sort of frankness.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does not the gentleman know that if one of these bureau heads was to do that he would be promptly fired from his position by the present authorities in Washington?

Mr. NEWTON. I do not know that, and I do not believe that is the case.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, all of the time that this subcommittee worked on this bill, every year, these bureaus have responded to such invitations from our committee, and in some cases when they made a case increases have been made, and no official has ever experienced any embarrassment or difficulty by reason of responding to such a request from the committee.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does not the gentleman know that it is almost impossible to get these heads of bureaus to express themselves when it is contrary to the President's financial policy?

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course—

Mr. ABERNETHY. Unless the committee wants them to do it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly; the law forbids their asking Congress for more than the Budget has recommended, and it is essential that that should be the law; but when Congress asks for information then that law is not effective, and I find them very generally responding. I have never known of any embarrassment to result to them from it.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if this Budget system is to work, there should be that frankness on the part of the bureau chiefs and a desire upon the part of the Appropriation Committee to really find out as to every substantial item, whether the bureau chief has the money which he feels he ought to have, and I do not feel that in this case that has been carried out by the head of the bureau. It is discouraging when a man puts in the time that a Member does on some of these pension claims because of the appeal that they have to one's sympathy, to find them handled in a perfectly perfunctory manner and when you get through not to know whether anybody has even read what you have put up to them. I hope for a decided change in the Bureau of Pensions in the handling of congressional correspondence. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. No further requests for time being made, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses incidental to the sale of timber, and for the expenses of administration of Indian forest lands from which such timber is sold to the extent that the proceeds of such sales are sufficient for that purpose, \$175,000, reimbursable to the United States as provided in the act of February 14, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 415).

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 21, line 14, strike out "\$175,000" and insert "\$200,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. I would simply state in that connection that from our investigations and the hearings we have had we find that their fund, which is really reimbursable out of sales of timber, is not sufficient to meet the need, and the effect of the smaller item would be that 8 per cent being deducted from the sales to cover expenses we would deduct from the Indians more than we will spend for the purpose, and to avoid that I think the item should be increased at least as much as I have indicated in the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Flathead Irrigation project, Montana: The unexpended balance of the appropriation for continuing construction of the irrigation systems on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont., contained in the act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 464-466), as continued available in the act of January 12, 1927 (44 Stat. L. 945), shall remain available for the fiscal year 1929, subject to the conditions and provisions of said acts: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the \$395,000 available for continuation of construction of a power plant may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, for the construction and operation of a power-distributing system and for purchase of power for said project but shall be available for that purpose only upon execution of an appropriate repayment contract as provided for in said acts: *Provided further*, That the net revenues derived from the operation of such distributing system shall be used to reimburse the United States in the order provided for in said acts: *Provided further*, That the Federal Power Commission is authorized, in accordance with the Federal water power act and upon terms satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, to issue a permit or permits or a license or licenses for the use, for the development of power, of power sites on the Flathead Reservation and of water rights reserved or appropriated for the irrigation projects: *Provided further*, That rentals from such licenses for use of Indian lands shall be paid the Indians of said reservation as a tribe, which money shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Indians, and shall draw interest at the rate of 4 per cent: *Provided further*, That the public notice provided for in the act of January 12, 1927, shall be issued by the Secretary of the Interior upon the 1st day of November, 1930: *Provided further*, That, in his discretion, the Secretary of the Interior may provide in such repayment contracts for covering into construction costs the operation and maintenance charges for the irrigation season of 1928 and all undistributed operation and maintenance cost, and may extend the time for payment of operation and maintenance charges now due and unpaid for such period as in his judgment may be necessary, not exceeding five years, the charges now due so extended to bear interest payable annually at the rate of 6 per cent per annum until paid, and to contract for the payment of the construction charges now due and unpaid within such term of years as the Secretary may find to be necessary with interest payable annually at the rate of 6 per cent per annum until paid: *Provided further*, That not more than \$35,000 of said reappropriated balance of \$395,000 shall be immediately available for operation and maintenance, and \$75,000 shall be available for construction of laterals near Ronan upon the execution of appropriate repayment contract as provided for in said acts.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I had not expected that this bill would be reached for reading until to-morrow, and as I did not get possession of the bill until to-day, I have not had time to go over it as carefully as I should have liked. I call the chairman's attention to page 56 of the bill, line 22:

South Dakota: Crow Creek Hospital, \$9,000.

Is that appropriation of \$9,000 to be used to alter some of the school buildings for use as hospitals? Is that the purpose of the appropriation?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is the appropriation for the maintenance of that hospital. The hospital has been in operation heretofore and this \$9,000 is for its maintenance.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I did not understand that the hospital at Crow Creek was in actual operation. I thought the plan was to reconstruct the school buildings there for hospital purposes, and I was wondering whether the appropriation is for that purpose.

Mr. CRAMTON. There has been an appropriation for the current year for this same hospital. The statement made to the committee was that the increase of \$1,500 would provide an additional nurse, so the hospital appears to be in operation and they are providing an additional nurse. That is the reason for the increase in the appropriation, which in the current year was \$7,500, while the bill before us carries \$9,000. It is a maintenance item.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I ask the chairman to turn to page 79. There he will find the item for the Belle Fourche irrigation project, South Dakota. The amount carried under that item is \$250,000, and I want to ask the chairman whether that is for drainage purposes?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is for drainage purposes entirely.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The total amount which will be required there, according to the estimates I have, is approximately \$1,000,000. I understand it is the purpose of the committee to commence this drainage work this year, to spend \$250,000, and then continue the work from year to year until the drainage is completed.

This \$250,000 is not made immediately available.

Mr. CRAMTON. They are all immediately available.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. So the construction of the drainage system can commence next spring? Ordinarily the appropriation would not be available until July 1.

Mr. CRAMTON. But these construction items are immediately available under reclamation, because, for the sake of economy, it is necessary to have the contract cover the construction season rather than a fiscal year.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I looked for the provision making it immediately available, but did not find it.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is in the first paragraph. There is \$33,000 for two siphons in the lateral system and \$217,000 for drainage construction.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That covers what I desired to know. I wanted to make certain that the drainage work could be commenced next spring and continued until it should be completed.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill down to and including line 12, page 54.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9136) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 89

*Resolved*, That F. D. LETTS, Iowa, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in case consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill has been completed, that when the House adjourns on Friday, January 13, it adjourn until Monday, January 16 next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

#### AIRPORT AT GOVERNORS ISLAND, N. Y.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, at the request of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. COHEN], by printing a letter he has written to Maj. Gen. Hanson E. Ely regarding the airport on Governors Island.



The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COHEN] to Gen. Hanson E. Ely, which is as follows:

JANUARY 7, 1928.

Maj. Gen. HANSON E. ELY,

Governors Island, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR GENERAL ELY: I have read the newspaper accounts of your statements before the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on Governors Island as a military necessity versus its use as an express airport station, and I desire to call your attention to a number of inaccuracies which, though perhaps not intentional, might give the public an erroneous impression of the suitability and advisability of Governors Island as an airport.

In the introduction to your speech you state that the subject will be "the pros and cons as to whether or not Governors Island, in whole or in part, should be used as an airport." Yet you fail to give one item favorable to Governors Island as an airport, confining yourself to the negative side entirely. Your speech seems to be merely a repetition of the arguments set forth by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York as to their objections to Governors Island as an airport, and it seems to me that the competent staff that assisted you in writing your speech took the greater part of it from the records of the chamber of commerce. All in all the speech seems clearly designed to meet the views of your hearers and to please them, and is not based on true facts and existing conditions.

Among your inaccuracies are the ones regarding Col. Charles A. Lindbergh's flights; the possibilities of planes hitting skyscrapers; the number of clear days at the island; fog and smoke; size of the island; and cost of conversion. None of these are borne out by facts.

You probably are not aware that thorough and extensive investigations made by a committee of the Sixty-eighth Congress, the Merchants' Association of the city of New York, the Hoover location committee, and the mayor's committee have all resulted in recommendations by these bodies for the use of Governors Island as an express airport to serve lower Manhattan and Brooklyn. These committees are all totally unbiased and are only concerned with the ultimate greatest benefit to the city and to the country.

If, as you state, the reason for the retention of Governors Island by the War Department is to house troops for the protection of the financial district, the following will prove conclusively that this need does not exist.

According to figures supplied by your predecessor, Maj. Gen. James H. McRae, Governors Island houses 112 officers and 1,055 men. A statement made by Representative LA GUARDIA, printed in the New York Times of August 7, 1927, is to the effect that according to data obtained from the office of The Adjutant General there were only 591 troops stationed on Governors Island.

You state that it would be advisable to protect with Government troops in times of domestic disturbances the subtreasury, customhouse, Federal reserve bank, and other Federal agencies, and that troops stationed on Governors Island could reach lower Manhattan with a minimum loss of time.

In refutation of this contention I cite the Wall Street explosion on September 16, 1920. The following is an extract from a letter received from Maj. Gen. J. H. McRae:

"Call for troops was received at Fort Jay at 12.10 p. m., September 16, 1920. A detachment of 2 officers and 57 men left Governors Island in trucks by ferry, arriving at the subtreasury at 12.45 p. m., same day. A second detachment of 4 officers and 48 men arrived at the subtreasury at 1.30 p. m. At 2.50 p. m. the detachments left the subtreasury and returned to Governors Island, arriving by the ferry leaving the Battery at 3.15 p. m."

Thus the entire detachment consisted of 6 officers and 105 men, and it took 1 hour and 20 minutes for 4 officers and 48 men to reach the scene of action. This will speak for itself as to the time necessary for troops to be moved to reach and to protect the financial district.

While on this subject may I state that, to my knowledge, this is the only time in 50 years that a call was made for Federal troops for the city of New York. I also call your attention to the following extract from a letter from Police Commissioner Joseph A. Warren:

"Please be advised that a survey of the department shows that 400 policemen could be brought into the financial district within half an hour. Of course, in the event of a serious outbreak this number could be almost indefinitely increased."

Also to extract from a letter written by Fire Commissioner John J. Dorman, as follows:

"We can assemble 100 men in the financial district in 15 minutes. Two engine companies can be operating with streams of water, which I understand are quite effective in dispersing rioters, in five minutes."

Also to extract from letter written by Gerhard M. Dahl, chairman of the board of directors of the Brooklyn-Manhattan Transit Corporation:

"It will take about 21 minutes for a train to go from the station nearest Fort Hamilton (which is Ninety-fifth Street) to Wall Street, and I am reliably informed that if this train skips stations it will take 17 minutes."

Therefore, if the financial district needs protection, the police and fire departments are able to give five times the amount of protection given by the soldiers on Governors Island in less than one-third the time, and troops can be brought from Fort Hamilton in less time than the same number of troops can be brought from Governors Island. In view of this, I see no reason why the troops stationed on Governors Island should not be removed and the island left available for an express landing field or airport, which is so necessary to the progress of New York City and of the United States.

I would ask you to send me duplicates of the maps that you used to illustrate your speech when you mentioned the airports Croydon, Le Bourget, and Tempelhof; also the map of Governors Island and the illustration you used to show the direction of the wind to confirm your statement that the wind for 11 months of the year is across the narrowest part of the island. I would also like a copy of the chart showing the enlargement of the island to an area 1,000 meters square, and also to an area 1 mile square, so as to compare it with the map of the harbor now in my possession.

You state that Governors Island is too small to be classed as a class A field. My bill to be introduced in Congress is for the use of Governors Island as a landing field or airport in conjunction with other fields located in the suburbs of New York, and that it will not rate as a class A field; it will rate as a class B field.

According to competent engineers, Governors Island contains 198 acres, and not 172 acres as you state. It is subject to an extension on both sides of the island's filled-in ground, which would give a width of approximately 1,000 feet at its narrowest point, a maximum width of 2,575 feet, and a maximum length of 4,500 feet, making it as large as Mitchel Field and larger than Roosevelt Field, Curtiss Field, and Miller Field. This can be further extended on both sides of the narrowest part of the island. The widening of the field on any part of the island will in no way obstruct the channel between Bedlows Island and Governors Island, but as a landing or express station in conjunction with other airports, no great extension of Governors Island is needed.

Such seasoned and eminent aviators as Commander Richard F. Byrd, Clarence Chamberlin, and Casey Jones have stated that there is nothing objectionable to Governors Island as a landing field. Clarence Chamberlin, in a speech at the National Republican Club, stated that Governors Island is large enough and is absolutely suitable for an airport. The experience and record of these men certainly gives their opinion more weight than the palpably biased statements of the military men and the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York.

The prevailing winds northwest and southwest are distinctly favorable to the use of Governors Island as an express airport and not unfavorable, as stated in your speech. I call your attention to the fact that if the winds from the southwest are in the direction of the island's greatest length, the winds from the northwest could not be directly across the narrowest part of the island.

Your statement regarding the velocity of winds on Governors Island is not borne out by official meteorological reports. According to these reports and surveys, the wind conditions at Governors Island are practically the same as at all airports situated around New York City.

Referring to your statement that New York Bay is unsuitable for seaplanes because of ice, the conditions there are no different than in the East River, Hudson River, Harlem River, or Jamaica Bay.

Fog conditions are 1 per cent better at Governors Island than at Jamaica Bay or even Sandy Hook. Hadley Field could not be used as a landing field for three successive days during the month of October because of fog. Commander Byrd was unable to find Le Bourget because of fog. So you see, all fields have the fog problem, and no one ever considered discontinuing the use of any existing fields because of this.

On December 31, 1927, fog conditions over lower Manhattan and Governors Island were very bad. I telephoned from my office at 120 Broadway to the Bronx fire headquarters and asked about the fog there, and received the report that the condition was very bad. I telephoned to the Queens fire headquarters and inquired about the fog conditions at Fort Tilden, and was told they were very bad. I telephoned to Curtiss Field, and the party who answered said there was no visibility and that the fog was very bad. I was not able to get a telephone connection with Hadley Field. This merely proves that the fog conditions in the Bronx, Jamaica Bay, and Curtiss Field are practically the same as on Governors Island.

You state that an airport should be provided with water, electric power, and good roads. As an express landing station Governors Island would not require any roads other than now on the island, and facilities for the transportation of passengers, mail, and small packages to the mainland could be readily improved, and at very little expense.

I would like you to send me a copy of map 5, which shows the proximity of high buildings to Governors Island. The nearest high building to Governors Island is 1 mile distant from the shore line of the

island, and an experienced aviator does not need 1 mile to make a landing.

The unsatisfactory features which you outline regarding size, weather, fog, wind, etc., were existent during the war. Why, then, did the Government use Governors Island as a training station for aviators during the war? I never heard of an inexperienced flyer crashing into any buildings on lower Manhattan or having any accident because of any other of the factors you bring forth against the use of Governors Island as an airport. If Governors Island was entirely suitable for the training of novices, why is it unsuitable for use by experienced flyers and up-to-date machines?

In your desire to retain Governors Island for a military station you entirely ignore—or overlook—the fact that all other airports are so far distant from the financial and business sections of the city of New York that it takes from 45 minutes to 1½ hours to bring the mail and packages to and from the field, whereas mail and passengers could be landed on Manhattan Island in 15 minutes after arriving on Governors Island.

This very important factor received no consideration from you, but the selfish desires of the War Department to maintain Governors Island as a home for officers on duty in the headquarters of the Department of the East are being allowed to deliberately supersede the advantages of the entire country of airport facilities that will prove of inestimable value to the future of the country.

I take strong exception to your statement calling for the elimination of Governors Island from future consideration as an airport, because the statement is actuated by ulterior motives, and is opposed to the opinions of a committee of Representatives of the United States, the Hoover location committee, the Merchants' Association of New York, the mayor's committee, and by all the prominent and distinguished aviators of the day.

I trust that this letter will convince you of the suitability of Governors Island as an express airport station, and of its greater value to the United States for this purpose than for a military post, and that you will be willing to recommend to the War Department that it release the island in favor of its use as an airport.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM W. COHEN,  
Member of Congress.

#### SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A joint resolution and bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution for the relief of Henry A. Bellows; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 440. An act for the relief of Charles H. Send; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 434. An act for the relief of Sadie Klauber; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 342. An act for the relief of George B. Booker Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 120. An act to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Clara E. Nichols; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3. An act for the relief of Kate Mathews; to the Committee on Claims.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 13, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, January 13, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

##### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To extend the benefits of the Hatch Act, the Adams Act, the Prunell Act, and the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska (H. R. 7952).

##### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.  
District of Columbia appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

##### COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.—caucus room)

To hear Col. John S. Sewell and members of the flood control committee of the Southern States' Republican League discuss proposed projects to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

(2 p. m.—caucus room)

To hear Representative Christopherson, of South Dakota, discuss flood-control problems.

##### COMMITTEE ON LABOR

(10.30 a. m.)

To divest goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined by convicts or prisoners of their interstate character in certain cases (H. R. 7729).

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(10 a. m.)

To amend section 321 of the Penal Code (H. R. 7200).

To amend the Penal Code of the United States as amended (H. R. 7736).

To amend the first paragraph of section 29, title 2, chapter 85, of the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, found in volume 41, part 1, page 361 of the United States Statutes at Large, relating to punishment for the illegal manufacture and sale of liquors (H. R. 50).

To regulate the admissibility of evidence in certain actions in the courts of the United States (H. R. 51).

##### COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

A meeting to hear Admiral Hughes discuss the building program.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES

(Immediately after adjournment of the House)

To authorize the payment of amounts appropriated by the Legislature of Alaska on account of additional duties imposed upon Territorial officers (H. R. 8284).

##### COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact (H. R. 5773).

##### COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

(10 a. m.)

To authorize an appropriation to provide additional hospitals and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (H. R. 5604).

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MICHENER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8229. A bill for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the sixth judicial circuit; without amendment (Rept. No. 267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9020. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9024. A bill to authorize the appointment of stenographers in the courts of the United States and to fix their duties and compensation; without amendment (Rept. No. 269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9026. A bill to amend section 1112 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9021. A bill providing for the punishment of persons escaping from Federal penal or correctional institutions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 271). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9051. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of February 22, 1875, entitled "An act regulating fees and costs, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 272). Referred to the House Calendar.



## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 2145. A bill for the relief of Albert J. Zyvoliski; with amendment (Rept. No. 266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8410) granting a pension to Laura Jane Chrysler; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8411) granting a pension to Ellen Treadwell; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8412) granting a pension to Rose Lapier; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 123) for the relief of Henry A. Bellows; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 9186) granting the consent of Congress to the Sistersville Ohio River Bridge Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a toll bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 9187) to amend the act entitled "An act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes," approved May 24, 1924; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9188) to amend section 604, subdivision (b), of the World War adjusted compensation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 9189) to repeal section 15a of the interstate commerce act, and to restore rates, fares, and charges authorized prior to increases effective August 26, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9190) to amend section 26 of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9191) to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9192) providing for the construction of certain works in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9193) to prohibit the collection of a surcharge for the transportation of persons or baggage in connection with the payment for parlor or sleeping car accommodations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9194) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land and erect a monument on the site of the battle between the Sioux and Pawnee Indian Tribes in Hitchcock County, Nebr., fought in the year 1873; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 9195) to amend sections 2804 and 3402 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9196) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Decatur-Kingston road in Roane County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9197) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Knoxville-Maryville road in Knox County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 9198) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Paris-Dover road in Henry and Stewart Counties, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 9199) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River on the Dover-Clarksville road in Stewart County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 9200) to provide for the appointment of three additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 9201) to provide for the more complete development of vocational education in the several States; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 9202) to authorize construction at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 9203) relating to the induction of registrants who applied and who were accepted for induction and assigned to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction without fault of their own was not completed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 9204) granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Current River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRITTON: A bill (H. R. 9205) to authorize an appropriation for the American group of the Interparliamentary Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 9206) authorizing acquisition of a site for the farmers' produce market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 9207) granting to the State of New Mexico certain lands for reimbursement of the counties of Grant, Luna, Hidalgo, and Santa Fe for interest paid on railroad-bond bonds, and for the payment of the principal of railroad-bond bonds issued by the town of Silver City, and to reimburse said town for interest paid on said bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MEAD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) for the purpose of providing a day of rest on December 25 of each year for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ENGLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 160) requesting certain information relative to the United States naval ordnance plant, South Charleston, W. Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 16) providing for the appointment of a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, to meet with a similar committee composed of the Commissioners of the Philippine Islands and seven members of the Philippine Legislature, to discuss general conditions in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 9208) granting an increase of pension to Mary Anthony; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BECK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9209) granting a pension to Ella Dibble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9210) for the relief of Lieut. George H. Hauge, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 9211) for the relief of Maj. Allen M. Burdett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 9212) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda M. Melson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 9213) granting relief to the widow of Albert F. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9214) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Prentice; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 9215) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Derstine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9216) granting an increase of pension to Mary Elizabeth Flegat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9217) granting a pension to Bertha C. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARKE: A bill (H. R. 9218) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 9219) for the relief of B. W. Dalton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9220) for the relief of David Thygerson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 9221) granting a pension to Leonora M. Knox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9222) for the relief of Charles G. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9223) granting a pension to Polly Ann Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9224) granting a pension to Celia Enright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9225) for the relief of Frank Baglione; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 9226) to authorize the reappointment of George F. Seyle as second lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLAND: A bill (H. R. 9227) granting relief to the trustees of Allegheny College, Blue Sulphur, Greenbrier County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 9228) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Griggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9229) granting an increase of pension to Christopher S. Alvord; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9230) granting a pension to Eliza Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9231) granting a pension to Charles Du-laney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9232) granting an increase of pension to Wilhelmina H. Schwallier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9233) granting an increase of pension to Ettie C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANCOCK: A bill (H. R. 9234) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 9235) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia C. Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 9236) granting a pension to Eliza E. Adkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9237) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Maxwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9238) for the relief of the widow of Ephriam E. Page; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9239) for the relief of the Shipowners & Merchants Tugboat Co. of San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 9240) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Gunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9241) granting a pension to Myrtle Grantham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEECH: A bill (H. R. 9242) granting an increase of pension to Hannah L. Hollen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9243) granting an increase of pension to Dillie Shuman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9244) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Reese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 9245) granting a pension to Mary A. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9246) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 9247) granting a pension to Julia H. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 9248) granting an increase of pension to John D. Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: A bill (H. R. 9249) granting retirement pay to Christ Roesch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 9250) granting a pension to Florence Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANSLEY: A bill (H. R. 9251) for the relief of Joseph M. McAleer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9252) for the relief of E. K. Lamont & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9253) granting an increase of pension to Bridget D. Boland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9254) granting a pension to Belle Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9255) granting a pension to Lillie Mueller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9256) to provide for a survey of the rivers in the New England States, with a view to the control of their destructive flood waters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 9257) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Isminger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 9258) for the relief of Aaron Freilich; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 9259) granting an increase of pension to Fidella Potts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9260) granting an increase of pension to Effie M. Livingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9261) granting an increase of pension to Alice F. McMullan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9262) granting an increase of pension to Hilda E. Lamott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9263) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Mawhirter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9264) granting an increase of pension to Betsy E. McAdow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9265) granting an increase of pension to Clara L. Stanbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 9266) granting an increase of pension to Marion J. Secor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9267) granting an increase of pension to Ellen A. Chappell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9268) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Lytle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 9269) granting a pension to Grady B. Baggett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 9270) granting an increase of pension to Addie Sour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9271) granting a pension to Catharine Lenz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9272) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9273) granting a pension to Charles O. B. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9274) granting an increase of pension to Falinda Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9275) granting an increase of pension to Lida O. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9276) granting a pension to Amanda Refitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUM: A bill (H. R. 9277) to pay the heirs of J. H. McVeigh, deceased, the sum of \$10,375; to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1421. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition from citizens of Mount Vernon, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1422. Also, petition from citizens of Avena, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1423. Also, petition from citizens of Mount Vernon and Albers, Ill., urging the passage of Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1424. By Mr. AYRES: Petition of citizens of Cassoday, Kans., with reference to the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1425. Also, petition of citizens of Wichita, Kans., with reference to the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1426. By Mr. BRIGHAM: Petition of W. R. Ovitt, George E. Wright, and 148 other citizens of Enosburg Falls and East Fairfield, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1427. By Mr. BARBOUR: Resolutions adopted by the Fresno County Chamber of Commerce, Fresno, Calif.; the Civic Com-



mercantile Association, Bakersfield, Calif.; and the Kings County Chamber of Commerce, Hanford, Calif.; opposing legislation which would place immigration from Mexico upon a quota basis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1428. Also, petitions of residents of the seventh congressional district of California, protesting against the Lankford Sunday bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1429. By Mr. BRIGHAM: Petition of W. E. Tatrow and 131 other citizens of Enosburg Falls, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1430. By Mr. BROWNING: Petition against the Lankford bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1431. Also, petition against the Lankford bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1432. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of Mrs. M. J. Herrmann, of Alameda, Calif., and many others urging the passage of legislation increasing the pensions of veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1433. Also, petition of J. Warner, of Berkeley, Calif., and many others, urging the passage of legislation increasing the pensions of veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1434. By Mr. CHALMERS: Resolution of the Exchange Club, of Toledo, Ohio, petitioning the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds to provide adequate and proper housing for its officers and enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1435. Also, letter signed by the chairman flag committee of Ursula Wolcott Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Toledo, Ohio, indorsing legislation relating to the proper and improper use of the United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1436. Also, petition signed by residents of Toledo, Ohio, in regard to increasing the pensions of all Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1437. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Milton Junction, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1438. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition signed by Mrs. Adelaide Banghart, Vassar, Mich., and 36 other residents of that vicinity, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1439. Also, petition signed by Fern Cummings, Otter Lake, Mich., and 31 other residents of that vicinity, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1440. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition signed by citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1441. By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of citizens of Manchester, Tenn., in favor of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1442. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition by citizens of Lockport, N. Y., protesting against the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1443. Also, petition by citizens of Middleport, N. Y., against the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1444. By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Boone County, Iowa, favoring increase of pension for soldiers of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1445. Also, petition of citizens of Carroll County, Iowa, opposing the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1446. By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Petition of citizens of Ravalli County, Mont., urging passage of the National Tribune's pension bill, granting increase in pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1447. By Mr. FENN: Petition of citizens of Granby, Conn., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the so-called compulsory Sunday observance bill, and any other bills of a like character; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1448. Also, petition of citizens of Hartford, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the so-called compulsory Sunday observance bill, and any other measure of like character; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1449. Also, petition of citizens of West Hartford, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the so-called compulsory Sunday observance bill, and any other measures of a like character; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1450. By Mr. FULBRIGHT: Petition of citizens of Poyner, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory legislation for Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1451. Also, petition of citizens of Garber, Mo., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory legislation for Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1452. Also, petition of citizens of Bryant, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory legislation for Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1453. Also, petition of citizens of Ava, Mo., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory legislation for Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1454. Also, petition of citizens of Bradleysville, Mo., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory legislation for Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1455. Also, petition of citizens of Forsyth, Mo., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory legislation for Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1456. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Maj. Gen. Edward L. Logan, Massachusetts National Guard, recommending amendment to section 113 of the national defense act to provide for annual national rifle matches; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1457. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Edinburg, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1458. Also, petition of citizens of Uvalde County, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1459. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Mrs. Gusta H. Behrendt and six other residents of Pine City, Minn., for an increase in the pensions awarded to the Union veterans of the Civil War, for those veterans in need of care and attendance and for the widows of the veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1460. Also, petition of W. L. Shrode and 13 other residents of Princeton, Minn., in opposition to the provisions of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1461. Also, petition by D. A. Dewey, Esq., and 129 other residents of Kanabec County, Minn., urging immediate legislation to provide an increase of pension to the Union veterans of the Civil War, for the veterans of that war requiring aid and attendance, and to the Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1462. Also, petition of Mrs. Mary A. Lindquist and 22 other residents of Chicago City, Minn., for an increase in pension to the Union veterans of the Civil War, for an additional increase to those veterans in need of care and attendance, and for an increase to the widows of the Union veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1463. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of residents of Kent, Wash., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1464. Also, petition of residents of Sedro Woolley and vicinity, Wash., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1465. Also, petition of residents of Carnation, Wash., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1466. By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of residents of Houlton, Mars Hill, Bridgewater, and Westfield, Me., against compulsory Sunday legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1467. Also, petition of Ulysses G. Mudgett and others, of Bangor, Me., urging legislation to increase the pensions of soldiers and their widows of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1468. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Mrs. Guy V. Abbott and 29 other residents of Branch County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1469. Also, petition of Carl Rainbow and 35 other residents of Climax, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1470. Also, petition of Mrs. C. J. Harrington and 37 other residents of Quincy, Mich., urging to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill carrying the rates proposed by the National

Tribune for relief of needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1471. By Mr. HOPE: Petition for legislation providing for increases in pensions for veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1472. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by 63 citizens of Reedsville, Ohio, petitioning Congress not to pass the compulsory Sunday observance bill nor any other bill enforcing the observance of the Sabbath; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1473. Also, petition signed by 15 citizens of Jackson, Ohio, protesting against the passage of any Sunday observance bill or any other bill enforcing the observance of the Sabbath or Lord's day; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1474. Also, petition signed by 132 voters of the tenth congressional district of Ohio, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill for relief of widows and veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1475. By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of numerous Vermillion County, Ind., voters for the increase of Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1476. Also, petition of numerous voters of Terre Haute, Ind., for the increase of Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1477. By Mrs. KAHN: Petition of numerous residents of California, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1478. Also, petition of numerous residents of California, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1479. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition by citizens of Highland County, Ohio, against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1480. Also, petitions of citizens of Scioto County, Ohio, against the passage of any compulsory observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1481. By Mr. KEMP: Petition of citizens of Hammond, La., protesting against House bill 78, Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1482. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Robert Prothero and 124 other residents, of Dowagiac, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1483. By Mr. LETTS: Petition of E. J. Blanchard and other citizens of Davenport, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or any other bill enforcing the proper observance of the Sabbath; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1484. Also, petition of F. J. Rhoades and other citizens of Clinton, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or any other bill enforcing the proper observance of the Sabbath; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1485. By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of Mrs. Jennie Brothers, Mr. J. H. Epperson, Lee Tribble, and about 85 other citizens of Sapulpa, Okla., asking for immediate action on a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1486. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Atwell, Mrs. R. A. Fleming, George E. Prince, and about 35 other citizens of the fourth congressional district, State of Oklahoma, asking for immediate action on a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1487. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of William Kirkley and 79 other residents of Bristol County, Mass., protesting against the enactment of the so-called compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1488. Also, petition of residents of Fall River, Mass., advocating the passage of a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1489. By Mr. MONAST: Petition against compulsory Sunday laws by citizens of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1490. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of sundry citizens of Jackson and Washtenaw Counties, Mich., asking for increase of Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1491. By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: Petition signed by Mrs. Catherine E. Watson, Olean Howard, W. C. Turner, Mrs. Mary W. Crawley, and 70 others, residents of Glasgow, Ky., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill for the relief of needy and suffering veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1492. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the National Association of Letter Carriers, of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging passage of Dale-Lehlbach bill so as to permit optional retirement of Federal employees after 30 years of service with an annuity of \$1,200 per annum; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1493. By Mr. NEWTON: Petition of Boyd E. Weatherly and other Minneapolis citizens, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1494. Also, petition of Mr. O. L. Hilde and others, of Minneapolis, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1495. Also, petition of W. V. Shepherdson, D. O., of Minneapolis, and others, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1496. Also, petition of Mrs. S. S. Johnston and others, of Minneapolis, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1497. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Petition of 104 citizens of New York City, protesting against enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1498. By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of Annie E. Barnes and 31 other citizens of Forest City, Ill., favoring Civil War widows' pension increase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1499. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition from Omie C. Huston and 123 citizens of Hampton, Franklin County, Iowa, protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1500. By Mrs. ROGERS: Petition of John E. Dearborn and 35 other residents of Andover, Mass., for relief of Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1501. By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Petition of Mrs. Luch Hester and others of Evansville, Ind., that the bill granting pensions to all Civil War widows be enacted into a law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1502. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of 22 residents of Paterson, Passaic, Clifton, Little Falls, and Hawthorne, N. J., favoring increased pensions for Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1503. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of John E. Thomas and other citizens of New Haven, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1504. By Mr. SPEAKS: Petition signed by some 50 citizens of Worthington, Franklin County, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1505. By Mr. STALKER: Petition of Ava G. Simkin and other citizens of Elmira, N. Y., urging against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1506. Also, petition of 96 citizens of Hornell, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1507. Also, petition of H. L. Leonard, of Hornell, N. Y., and 626 other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1508. Also, petition of 90 citizens of Hornell, N. Y., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1509. Also, petition of Charles A. Kimble, of Horseheads, N. Y., and other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1510. Also, petition of Mrs. Adelia Carrier, of Apalachin, N. Y., and other citizens of that vicinity, urging the enactment of a Civil War pension bill to provide for an increase in pension for Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1511. Also, petition of Mrs. Melvina E. Johnson and other citizens of Elmira, N. Y., urging the enactment of a Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1512. Also, petition of Mrs. Hannah Ball and other citizens of Valois, N. Y., urging the enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1513. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Brookville, Pa., in favor of legislation to increase the rates of pension for Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1514. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by J. N. Boggan and 49 others of Asotin, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1515. Also, petition signed by Helen E. Davis and others, of Yakima County, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.



1516. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition of numerous citizens of Anchorage, Ky., favoring increase of pensions to Civil War soldiers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1517. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of four citizens of Ringgold County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1518. Also, petition of 31 citizens of Cedar County, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1519. Also, petition of 14 citizens of Sharpsburg, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1520. Also, petition of 28 citizens of Sharpsburg, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1521. Also, petition of 68 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1522. Also, petition of 23 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1523. Also, petition of 75 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1524. Also, petition of 35 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1525. Also, petition of 50 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1526. Also, petition of 30 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1527. Also, petition of 30 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1528. Also, petition of 40 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1529. Also, petition of 42 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1530. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Charles O. Butler and other citizens of Cheshire, Conn., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1531. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of residents of the eighth congressional district of Michigan urging early action on a bill granting more liberal pensions to Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1532. By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: Petition of Carter County (Ky.) citizens on Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1533. Also, petition of Lawrence County (Ky.) citizens against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1534. By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: Petition from sundry citizens of Denver, Colo., protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1535. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Denver, Colo., urging the passage of a Civil War pension bill looking to granting increase of pensions to veterans of that war and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, January 13, 1928

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 11, 1928)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

LXIX—90

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	McKellar	Sheppard
Barkley	Fletcher	McLean	Shipstead
Bayard	Frazier	McMaster	Shortridge
Bingham	George	McNary	Smoot
Black	Gerry	Mayfield	Steck
Blaine	Gillett	Metcalf	Steiwer
Blease	Glass	Neely	Stephens
Borah	Gould	Norbeck	Swanson
Bratton	Greene	Norris	Thomas
Brookhart	Hale	Nye	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Oddie	Tydings
Bruce	Hawes	Overman	Tyson
Capper	Hayden	Phipps	Wagner
Caraway	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Howell	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Curtis	Jones	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Cutting	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Deneen	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	
Dill	King	Sackett	
Edge	La Follette	Schall	

Mr. JONES. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained in a hearing before the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. My colleague the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is necessarily detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

### REFUND OF PASSPORT FEES ERRONEOUSLY COLLECTED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, requesting that section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the issue and validity of passports, and for other purposes," Sixty-ninth Congress, session 1, approved July 3, 1926, Public No. 493, be amended so as to authorize the refund of passport fees erroneously collected otherwise than under the existing authority contained in that section.

I concur in the view of the Secretary of State, and I therefore request of the Congress legislation amending section 3 of the act of July 3, 1926, in the sense suggested.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 13, 1928.

### SECOND INTERNATIONAL EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION CONFERENCE (S. DOC. NO. 40)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting that legislation be enacted to provide funds to cover the expense of this Government's participation in the Second International Emigration and Immigration Conference to be held at Habana commencing March 31, 1928. The Secretary of State sets forth in his letter the reasons why it is considered advisable that the United States be represented at this conference.

I concur in the view of the Secretary of State that this Government should participate in the Second International Emigration and Immigration Conference, and therefore request of the Congress legislation appropriating \$5,000 for each and every expense connected with the representation of the United States at that conference, including travel, subsistence, or per diem in lieu thereof in amounts authorized in the discretion of the Secretary of State (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), and compensation of employees as the Secretary of State shall consider necessary and authorize in his discretion.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 13, 1928.

### ELECTRIC-POWER INDUSTRY—SUPPLY OF ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT AND COMPETITIVE CONDITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 329, Sixty-eighth Congress, second session (agreed to February 9, 1925), a report